DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 312 CE 063 000

TITLE	Community Works Progress Act of 1992. Hearing on S. 2373 To Amend the Job Training Partnership Act To Establish a Community Works Progress Program, a Youth Community Corps Program, and a National Youth Community Corps Program, and for Other Purposes, before the Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. United States Senate, One Hundred Second Congress, Second Session.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-038904-6; Senate-Hrg-102-687
PUB DATE	21 May 92
NOTE	62p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Community Services; *Disadvantaged; *Employment Programs; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Futures (of Society); Job Development; Job Training; *Public Service; Unemployment; Young Adults; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd; Proposed Legislation

ABSTRACT

This document contains written statements and oral testimony of witnesses who testified at a U.S. Senate hearing on the proposed Community Works Progress Act of 1992. The testimony centered on the United States' massive unemployment problem and the need to provide jobs and hope for many people. Sentiment was strong for passage of the Community Works Progress Act in order to create programs such as those developed by the Works Progress Administration of the 1930s. Such a program would create jobs and enable young people to get an education and upgrade their skills so as to live a more productive life in the future. At the same time, participants in the program would provide work needed by the nation as a whole, such as work in schools, with youth, with the elderly, in building roads and bridges, and in clean-up projects for parks and cities. Those who testified included senators, representatives of youth advocacy organizations, and city officials who had experience in similar types of programs. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

S. HRG. 102-687

COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS ACT OF 1992

ED354312

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON

EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2373

TO AMEND THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT TO ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS PROGRAM, A YOUTH COMMUNITY CORPS PROGRAM, AND A NATIONAL YOUTH COMMUNITY CORPS PROGRAM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

MAY 21, 1992

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
56-260 WASHINGTON : 1992

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-038904-6

CE063000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
KRISTINE A. IVERSON, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, FAMILY, DRUGS AND ALCOHOLISM

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota

DAN COATS, Indiana
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

RICHARD J. TARPLIN, *Staff Director*
STEPHANIE JOHNSON MONROE, *Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1992

	Page
Simon, Hon. Paul, a U.S. Senator from the State of Illinois, prepared statement	2
Mikulski, Hon. Barbara A., a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland, prepared statement	5
Wofford, Hon. Harris, a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania	8
Prepared statement	11
Boren, Hon. David L., a U.S. Senator from the State of Oklahoma	13
Reid, Hon. Harry, a U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada	19
Prepared statement	21
Warner, Hon. John W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia	22
Sweeney, Eileen, director of government affairs, Children's Defense fund; Anthony R. Fairbanks, executive director, Philadelphia Youth Service Corps; Frank Slobig, director of policy and programs, Youth Service America; Mickey Kaus, senior editor, The New Republic, and author, "The End of Equality"; and Kathleen Selz, executive director, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps	26
Prepared statements:	
Ms. Sweeney	28
Mr. Fairbanks	32
Mr. Slobig	35
Mr. Kaus	40
Ms. Selz	46
Schmoke, Kurt, mayor of Baltimore, prepared statement	52

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Statements, articles, letters, etc.:	
Public Service, from The Philadelphia Inquirer, Wednesday, March 15, 1989	56
For hints on how the races can coexist, look no farther than the U.S. military, from The Philadelphia Inquirer, by David S. Broder, Wednesday, May 13, 1992	56

COMMUNITY WORKS PROGRESS ACT OF 1992

THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1992

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 3:06 p.m., in room SD-430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Kennedy, Simon, and Thurmond.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR SIMON

Senator SIMON. The subcommittee hearing will come to order. We are having hearings on a bill that Senator Boren is the chief sponsor of, that several of us are cosponsoring. It is a modification of a bill that I introduced sometime ago, and my hope is that at least as a demonstration project we can move ahead on this issue.

The Monday after Los Angeles, I had a meeting scheduled that I had scheduled sometime before where I heard from a variety of Hispanic leaders from the Chicago area. There are about a million Hispanics living in the Chicago area. And much of the talk was about Los Angeles and its meaning for the rest of the Nation.

The one word that was used over and over again was "hopelessness." I really believe that is true of much of urban America today; but not just urban America, the rural areas also. There are Indian reservations and a variety of other places where we have similar problems.

The great division in our society is not between black and white or Hispanic and Anglo; it is between people who have hope and those who have given up.

Two things give people hope. One is to see either themselves or their children move ahead educationally, and the second is to have a job. And it just seems to me that it is so obvious that we have huge needs in this country We have so many people who are unemployed. Why don't we put the two together?

That is what happened in this Nation under the WPA. And some may criticize us for looking back, but you can learn from history. It is a different workforce today—many more women, for example, participate in the labor force—so you can't just duplicate the WPA. But we had millions of Americans who learned how to read and write under the WPA program. It wasn't simply buildings that were being built.

I can remember being about 11 or 12, reading Richard Wright's book "Black Boy," which is not as famous as his "Native Son," but I remember reading it and being moved. And it wasn't until some years later that I learned that he learned how to become a writer as part of a WPA project. We enriched this Nation in so many ways.

I believe we can do this again, and my hope is that not only will we have this hearing, but that we will move very quickly—Senator Kennedy and I have discussed this—that we can move very quickly on some legislation that really will give some people in some areas of our Nation some hope.

I think the fiscal reality is that we can't do a massive national WPA program immediately, but we ought to be able to pick three or four urban areas; we ought to be able to find a similar number of rural areas, and maybe an Indian reservation or two and establish some WPA programs. We ought to be able to do something that really is meaningful.

[The prepared statement of Senator Simon follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR SIMON

Today we will hear testimony on S. 2373, the Community Works Progress Act of 1992. This legislation would establish a job opportunity program. Our nation's communities desperately need jobs. I want to commend my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator Boren, for his leadership on this matter. This is a bill that is long overdue.

Recently, there has been a great deal of public discussion about the causes of the poverty, unemployment, and crime plaguing our communities. The people who are living on the edge today, barely able and many unable to support themselves and their families, are being told that it's all their fault. That somehow they have the wrong values and that those wrong values condemn them to a lifetime of poverty. This is unfair and wrong. I am certain that I am not the only Senator receiving letters from children, asking for help to fund their schools and for help for their parents to find work. Do these sound like the wrong values? Children who plead for but never get an education, a home, and a chance to see their parents proud to support their family, often become angry, frustrated, or hopeless young adults. Our entire country watched how this anger and frustration can be transformed into violence during the riots this month in Los Angeles. I am ashamed. But I am hopeful because we are considering a bill here today that would enable communities to come together to rebuild their parks, clean up their streets, tutor the illiterate, and transform the anger, frustration and hopelessness into pride and trust in their own successes and the success of our nation.

We have to do something to enable every person to participate in making this country more productive. In April 1991, We had 8,274,000 people who were listed as unemployed. In April 1992, 9,155,000 Americans were unemployed—an increase of 881,000 who are listed as unemployed. I will get back to why I mentioned listed.

In my State of Illinois, in April 1991, 388,000 people were listed as unemployed. In April 1992, one year later, 476,000 Illinoisans were unemployed—an increase of 88,000 in one State.

I say listed as unemployed because this does not count the discouraged worker, the person who is just given up, who no longer is signing up at the unemployment office—who has lost hope for ever finding a job. These figures do not count the person who works part-time, but wants a full-time job. If you work one hour a week, you are not counted as unemployed.

The great division in our society is not between black and white; not between Hispanic and Anglo; not even between rich and poor. It is between those who have hope and those who have given up. We have too many people in our society who have given up and we cannot afford to continue to allow this to happen.

We need to give two things to those who need hope. One is a job and the feeling that they are offering something, contributing something in a productive way to their family and to society. The second thing is the assurance that their children receive a decent education.

We have to give people one of those two indications of hope, and we can really give them both. There are all kinds of things that need to be done for people in our country. And we have all kinds of people who are unemployed. Why do we not have the good sense to mesh these two needs?

For some time, I have been working on this concept and I am very pleased to have Senator Boren join in this effort. I wrote a book a few years back, called "Let's Put America Back to Work," suggesting that we really can learn from that WPA concept. We have, for example among the unemployed, a great many people who can contribute to society. In fact, while I was on a radio call-in show someone called in and said, "Believe it or not, I have a doctorate, and I am temporarily out of work. I am sure it is temporary. But if I could be teaching someone how to read and write or doing something like that, I would be happy to do it.

There is no reason why we cannot be doing that. We have all kinds of people who do not know how to read and write. We have people who know how and who are unemployed. Why do we not put the two together?

I have said many times that the true test of the strength of our nation is our ability to compete in a global economy. We cannot compete unless every person has the opportunity to receive an education and put that education to work. As the bipartisan America's Choice report concluded:

"The choice that America faces is a choice between high skills and low wages. Gradually, silently, we are choosing low wages. We still have time to make the other choice one that will lead us to a more prosperous future. To make this choice we must fundamentally change our approach to work and education."

I believe it is time we made that fundamental change.

We have learned that our investments in technology and capital alone are insufficient to enable us to compete. We have also learned that industries and communities in other developed countries have benefited from better national education and workforce preparation systems. It is not just better facilities and higher technology that increase the productivity of a nation but also the skill level of the labor force and the availability of education and job training for all workers. Together, education and job training make

up the second most important thing we can offer our children, our young adults and every working American who is striving to do better.

Senator Kennedy and Senator Hatfield have taken a leadership role in introducing and supporting S. 1790, the High Skills Competitive Workforce Act. Tnis important legislation would create a nationwide system of evaluating, certifying, training, and upgrading the education and skills of the labor force. S. 1790 would set in motion a workforce preparation system that would strengthen our nation's ability to compete in this global economy by increasing the productivity of our workers.

My heart goes out to the American families who are struggling to get through each day. It is my hope that my colleagues and I will soon be able to pass legislation to put America back to work. I want laid off workers, the discouraged and the unemployed throughout this country to know that they are valuable, contributing members of our workforce. I want job opportunities for everyone and I want to fund this program to prevent the despair and deterioration in our communities that unemployment and hopelessness cause.

Senator SIMON. Let me call now on my colleague, Senator Kennedy.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNEDY

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I certainly want to express all of the committee's appreciation to you for having these hearings and for your moving this whole process forward. We look forward to taking action. We want to work closely with our friends on the Finance Committee—Senator Moynihan, Senator Boren, and others—as we try to respond to the issue of jobs in our society. That is what we are really interested in and committed to.

I want to join in welcoming all of our colleagues and commend them for their work on the Community Works Progress Act. This bill is an important contribution to the debate on work and welfare, and it moves beyond the argument about whether the Great Society works or whether the administration's six-point plan for urban ills will work by returning to ideas that everyone agrees did work.

The New Deal jobs program, the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Work Progress Administration, provided government jobs of last resort to the unemployed, not make-work jobs but jobs whose results we still see around us in bridges and roads and public art. WPA work has built or improved 651,000 miles of roads, 39,000 schools, 464 airports. We must be aware, however, that the individuals we want to reach with these programs have important differences with the individuals who participated in the New Deal programs.

As the chairman mentioned, single mothers often need remedial education or job training as well as supportive services such as child care if they are to work productively.

I am also concerned that we do not displace public employees, thereby creating a new unemployed person for every one we place in a public sector job.

We need not look back all the way to the New Deal to find examples of youth training programs that work. The youth corps concept has been tried effectively on a small scale across the country. I know that Senator Wofford has had a great deal of experience with youth corps when he was Secretary of Labor and Industry in Pennsylvania.

I have seen the success of City Year in Boston. I had a City Year participant, a young man, in my office a few weeks ago, and he told me with much emotion that before he joined City Year, he was unemployed with a drug problem. He is now in a youth corps and feels that his life has been turned around.

City Year and youth service programs like it are currently operating in many communities. These youth corps, which employ young people in community service projects that meet many of the critical unmet needs of our cities, provide a double benefit. The participants benefit by learning important job and life skills, and the cities benefit from hundreds of thousands of hours of community service that otherwise would have gone undone.

These corps members work in schools, homeless shelters, parks, senior citizen centers, hospitals, and on the streets. They assist the frail elderly, feed the homeless, rehabilitate dilapidated housing, clean up parks and abandoned lots, and provide role models for children who are often ignored and neglected.

The cost of the programs outlined in S. 2373 will not be small. At its height, the WPA's budget was in excess of $30 billion per year in today's dollars. So let us not fool ourselves. For all the rhetoric about welfare, we have never committed the resources for providing an actual job. The so-called new paternalism under which States reward welfare recipients for positive behavior and punish them for unacceptable behavior are, at best, an incentive to get a job but not a job itself.

So I look forward to working with you to explore some new and old approaches to give welfare recipients and young people the dignity of serious work.

I thank the Chair.

Senator SIMON. Thank you, Senator Kennedy.

[The prepared statement of Senator Mikulski follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKULSKI

We are here today to discuss Senator Boren's bill, the Community Progress Act. I am a cosponsor of this bill because it creates jobs and it helps our communities.

We need jobs. And this bill helps to create jobs today, not two or three years from now. And these are jobs for the people who need them most—welfare recipients, those on public assistance and or those who are unemployed.

Senator Boren's "New W.P.A." bill doesn't throw money at a problem—instead it invests in people willing to help themselves. This bill builds on a concept I used to write the National Service Act—the simple idea that people want to help their neighbors, and

that serving has a multiplier affect. Letting people contribute to their communities, and get training for a future job is a good idea. People have the opportunity to help others as they learn skills, and tax needs in communities. That makes a lot of sense, and I'm glad to do what I can to help move this bill along.

But I also want to talk about the need for a comprehensive look at the problems that plague our cities. Many factors contribute to our Nation's problems. What we need is a comprehensive package that shows we have studied our past mistakes and have learned from them.

Let us carefully analyze the lessons we have learned so we can anticipate the consequences of any new programs we may put in place or any more money that we may pour into existing programs.

Let's talk about the problem of Welfare.

What do we know about welfare? We know that many people stay on welfare because they don't have a better place to go. If they leave the roles, they frequently have no skills, no job, no education, no health insurance, and no child care. Without all this how can they do better?

We know that any plan we come up with to address the problem of welfare it must include job training program, child care and extension of medical assistance. And, there has got to be some transitional period in which welfare recipients still receive child care and Medicaid benefits, if this is going to work. I also believe we need a "good guy" bonus for those employers who bring people on from the welfare rolls.

When we address welfare, we've got to get rid of the punitive attitude toward the welfare mother, and instead, start bringing the welfare family back together. We should allow the man back into the house and get after those "deadbeat dads" who won't financially support their children.

Let's treat welfare as a supplement to help those who are trying to make it. Of course, with every opportunity comes responsibility. These mothers can be responsible. They want to work, but they need skills and they need jobs. We've got to train these mothers within the JTPA framework for jobs that exist. Let's keep American jobs at home. No more fast track to Mexico.

People don't want to be on welfare any more than we want them to. But, they know better than anyone that a full time job can still mean full time poverty. This has to change.

I hope we can work together on this effort to come up with a substantive plan to address our cities problems.

Senator SIMON. Before I call on our colleagues, you used one phrase that I confess irks me, along with another phrase that I hear, and that is "make-work jobs." Make-work jobs are better than no-work checks. And if you can give people a chance for being proud of themselves for what they contribute, let's do that.

The other elitist phrase is "dead-end jobs." It is a white-collar phrase that looks down on people, for example, who clean this room. To some people, that would be a dead-end job. Let me tell you, the people who clean this room may do more than some of us who spin our wheels on other activities in terms of constructive

work. And there are many, many people who are eager for what some people label "dead-end jobs."

Senator Boren, Senator Wofford was here first. If it is all right with you, rather than the chief sponsor, we will call on Senator Wofford first here.

Senator BOREN. I would be happy to have Senator Wofford go first. I will come up and join him.

Senator SIMON. We will get both of you up, and while we are waiting for you two to be seated, we have been joined by Senator Thurmond. We are very happy to have you with us here today, Senator Thurmond. Do you have an opening statement, Senator Thurmond?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR THURMOND

Senator THURMOND. Yes. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to receive testimony on S. 2373, the Community Works Progress Act of 1992. I wish to join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming the chief sponsor of this legislation, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Senator Boren; and Senator Reid of Nevada and Senator Wofford of Pennsylvania who are cosponsors.

As we consider "New Deal-jobs creation" legislation, it is important that we keep in mind potential long-term costs to the Federal Government. With a Federal deficit of over $350 billion and a total Federal debt of $4 trillion, we need to carefully consider the cost implications of this bill. Job creation programs can be costly, particularly given our experience with similar programs under the old Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. I am informed by the Department of Labor that the costs today to fund a 1-year job—including salary, benefits, training costs and services, and administrative overhead—would be an estimated $18,900. The comparable cost in 1980 was $10,500. Multiplied many times over, this could be a significant expense to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the purpose of the Job Training Partnership Act is job training. This legislation, on the other hand, represents a departure from that purpose. By having the Federal Government subsidize community improvement jobs, we are changing the scope of the Job Training Partnership Act. I am concerned about moving the Federal Government in the direction of job creation, which has traditionally been left to the private sector.

Job training is an appropriate role for the Federal Government, and JTPA has been successful in providing a good system of job training and placement for the economically disadvantaged. I believe continuing to maintain the existing focus of JTPA allows us to wisely utilize Federal resources, leaving job creation to the private sector.

Again, it is a pleasure to be here, and I look forward to the testimony while I am here. I have to leave after a little bit to be at another hearing, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SIMON. Thank you for being here and for your statement.

Senator Boren, Senator Wofford, which one of you has decided to go first?

Senator WOFFORD. My leader lets me come to bat first.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRIS WOFFORD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator WOFFORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is an honor to be with you in support of the Community Works Progress Act of 1992. That bill combines the spirit of service and the structure of work, and I salute Senator Boren and the chairman. Senator Simon has pursued this point for many years with diligence and devotion. And I salute Senator Kennedy, the driving force behind the National and Community Service Act of 1989, which also provides a structure for work and service, supported by Senator Mikulski and Senator Hatch and Senator Nunn.

If Senator Thurmond is going to leave, I would like to take up just one point before we lose you for the moment. It is a little bit of an argument with the chairman about the make-work jobs.

I agree with you completely that the nature of work is that there is dignity in any job that needs to be done. But a lot of the jobs that are now structured for our young in the JTPA program are—if you don't want to call them make-work jobs, they are not the kind of jobs that make the maximum contribution to the community or to the transforming of the lives of the young people.

As you may know, I administered the JTPA Act in Pennsylvania for four-and-a-half years. In one community in Pennsylvania about half of the youth money mandated in JTPA goes into work experience, Senator Thurmond. I think about more than $700 million can be attributed to jobs in the JTPA program.

I don't quarrel with your point about job training programs if they are good. But in the present JTPA program, there are hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on what is called work experience, and they range from giving that money to well-organized, demanding youth corps—one community where a corps transformed—under the carpenters' union and an architect, a historical commission—a group of 1860 houses and the corps members learned about history and learned about house building—and got apprenticeship opportunities in the carpenters' union and it was operated with an esprit de corps; and the other kind of work, the other end of the spectrum, is represented by a young summer JTPA worker who was in the back room with a huge garbage bin. And the social agency to which he was divvied out explained to me that, well, they throw all their papers in the bin during the year that they don't think they will ever need, but they are not allowed to throw away, and they save it for the summer JTPA worker. So there is a lot of money now being used that if it is directed into projects with goals and with leadership could be much better structured.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriate day to hold a hearing on this bill. On this date, May 21, 1945, Francis Perkins resigned as Secretary of Labor after serving at that post for a remarkable 12 years. It was Francis Perkins who helped Franklin Roosevelt devise the idea of the Civilian Conservation Corps and who was one of its chief architects.

I don't know if you know the history that on March 14, 1933, Franklin Roosevelt proposed the idea of a Civilian Conservation Corps to Francis Perkins and some of his colleagues. One week

later, they had a message from the President to Congress. Two weeks later, Congress passed a two-page Act establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps. Roosevelt said, "Let's have the Army set up the camps, the Labor Department recruit the people." In three days, Francis Perkins had the recruitment drive going on through all the labor offices around the country. Roosevelt said, "Let's have 250,000 young men in the woods by mid-summer as the goal," and by the end of July 1933, two months later, three months later, they had over 300,000 young men in the CCC camps and a very notable leader of a number of those camps in the Southwest was General George Catlett Marshall. So where are George Marshall and Francis Perkins and Franklin Roosevelt when we need them?

Their concept of work, not welfare, active-duty citizenship, service to the community, is just what we need to rekindle today in our country. In Los Angeles, walking the streets, talking with people the second day after the riots, smelling the smoke, I was time and time again reminded that it was not just an explosion and a crisis of cities or of race, but it was perhaps, above all, the explosion came from the crisis of our young. Not all the people in the riots were of any one ethnic or cultural background, but all day long in Los Angeles two weeks ago Sunday, the point was hammered: They were all young.

We are losing our young to alienation, hopelessness, frustration, anger, epidemic of crack cocaine, gangs that replace family, church, and any other institution that instills values of responsible citizenship and productive workmanship.

Out of that tragedy, though, in Los Angeles were signs of hope, where you see that if challenging alternatives are given, there is promise and possibility. That Friday night, some of you may have noted, after two days of riots, Edward James Olmos, the star of "Stand and Deliver" and "Miami Vice," went station by station to the television stations and said, "Meet me 6:00 a.m. tomorrow morning with shovel and broom, and we are going to clean up the mess caused by the fire, and then we are going to work together to clean up the mess that caused the fire." And 5,000 young people and older people assembled 6 a.m. Saturday morning, and when I was there Sunday morning, there were estimated at least 20,000 people in teams all over cleaning the sidewalks cleaner than they had been for a long time, though the debris was there.

The seeds of service and the idea of work need to be planted in our young people, because the toughest indictment of our current system of welfare dependency and the best argument of how to change it was given to me by a young Youth Service Corps member from Tony Fairbanks' Philadelphia Youth Service Corps a few years ago. When I pressed him on why he had left the gang he was in on the street—he was a high school dropout—he said something like this: Look, all my life, people have been coming to do good against me. I got tired of people always trying to help me. This corps, for the first time in my life, asked me to do something to help, and I am doing something and I am making a difference.

Over the years, I have come to believe that that is the crucial psychological point that we have got to turn right side up. It is buried now in our whole top-down, patronizing approach to assisting young people.

I think changes such as are proposed in this Act come about when two conditions are met: one is when something becomes a self-evident truth; and, second, when there is a sense of scandal. And I think we have reached the point where it is a self-evident truth that there should be work, not welfare, wherever possible, and that it is possible to begin applying that principle to the young.

Second, I think people recognize it is a scandal that we let another generation, generation after generation--I walked in Watts three days after those riots 27 years ago. Generations of young people, we let drop out of school, graduate into the streets, joblessness, drugs, the dependency systems of welfare or prison, when we know there are things we can do about it.

It is a scandal that in a society with children who need care, roads that need repair, bridges that need building, we allow, and sometimes pay, able men and women to sit idle. Unemployed workers and young people have been idle too long. Today in Pennsylvania we have workers and in other States, young and adult, who are ready to work on worthwhile, demanding projects. But somebody must enable them to do so. Somebody must ask them to serve, to serve and not to be served. They need to be asked.

I think where this leads is that we need to jump back to the thing that worked in the Great Depression. What worked was the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Works Progress Administration. What worked was enlisting two-and-a-half million young unemployed Americans in residential, Army-run camps in or on the edge of our parks and forests.

Franklin Roosevelt said, "Probably the best thing that I did was the Civilian Conservation Corps." Just as Roosevelt in the 1930's did in calling on the Army, we could call on our military officers and noncommissioned officers to provide the leadership and teaching skills that are required. We have got thousands of trained military personnel, skilled in the training of the young, slated for early discharge because of the changes in the world. We also have reservists and National Guardsmen in search of new employment opportunities and a new challenge like this.

As Senator Nunn has pointed out, these men and women are a national resource who should not be wasted, and so are our young, if we stop viewing them as the problem, as the enemy, as the menace, but as part of the solution, if we view them as resources and talents waiting to be tapped. What worked with Roosevelt was putting people to work, and that is what we must do again today. Just as the GI Bill after World War II was one of the best investments America ever made, so was the Civilian Conservation Corps, and so will be the programs that are proposed under this Act.

In conclusion, I want to say that this is an idea that I believe truly transcends politics, that goes beyond left or right, that draws on the liberal agenda and the conservative agenda at the same time. It is an idea that brings Arthur Ashe and General Schwarzkopf, Bill Buckley and Bill Clinton, Marian Wright Edelman and Father Hesburgh together on the same platform, along with the memory of Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, and George Marshall.

"Serve, earn and learn" is the motto of the Service Corps. More than 60 such corps exist on a small scale around the country. They

have proved that they work. They have been pilot programs. The purpose of a pilot program is to have the pilot, when the program works, ignite the furnace, and that is what I hope this bill will do—to ignite the whole so we can ask and give opportunities to all young people to work together to transform our country, their communities, and themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Wofford follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT SENATOR WOFFORD

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it's an honor to appear before you today in support of the "Community Works Progress Act of 1992." The bill combines the spirit of service with a structure of work. I salute Senator Boren and the Chairman for their efforts in putting this legislation together.

Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriate day to hold a hearing on this bill. On this date, May 21, in 1945, Frances Perkins resigned as Secretary of Labor after serving at that post for a remarkable 12 years. It was Frances Perkins, who, helped Franklin Roosevelt devise the idea of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Mr. Chairman, we need to reach back to the ideas of Franklin Roosevelt and Frances Perkins again today. To their concept of work, not welfare, to active duty citizenship and service to one's community that needs to be rekindled in our cities and our country today.

Two days after the riots, from dawn until dusk, I was in the streets of South-Central Los Angeles. I saw the burned-out stores, smelled the smoke, and talked with the people. What I learned there was that, first of all, this isn't just a crisis of cities, or of race. It is first and foremost a crisis of our young people.

In his Paradise Baptist Church, Pastor A. D. Iverson sat in his dark study without electricity, with two candles flickering on the table, pressing the point that not all the rioters were of one ethnic or cultural background, but all were young.

We are losing our young, the Pastor told me, to alienation, hopelessness, frustration, and anger, to the epidemic of crack cocaine, to the gangs that replace family, church or any other institution that instills the values of responsible citizenship and productive workmanship.

"This was a wake-up call," Reverend Iverson said. "Pray God we don't press the snooze button." The lack of good education, the lack of challenging work or good jobs for which they are ready, the lack of constructive alternatives and opportunities for the young was the crux of the problem, the pastor said. As this legislation wisely recognizes, it also points to the core of the solution.

For out of the tragedy in Los Angeles were also signs of hope. That Friday night after two days of riots, a clarion call for citizen service was made. Thousands of people responded to the summons of actor Edward James Olmos—star of *Stand and Deliver and Miami Vice* to begin the clean up—and they are still there—helping in service to their community.

The seeds of service and the idea of work need to be planted in all our young people. The toughest indictment of our current system of welfare dependency—and the best argument for how to change it—was best put to me a few years ago by a young high school dropout, this time in Philadelphia. He had gone from a street gang into the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps.

When I pressed him on why he had enlisted in the Corps, he said something like this:

"Look, all my life people have been coming to do good against me, I got tired of people trying to help me all the time. This Corps asked me to do the helping. I'm doing something now, making a difference."

Over the years, I've come to believe major reforms are possible when two conditions occur: when the basic proposition has become self-evident and when the lack of action is recognized as a scandal.

Work not welfare is now a self-evident truth and we know we can begin applying this principle to the young. We understand that personal responsibility and self-esteem can't simply be taught, they have to be earned.

It's a scandal that we know this but sit by while another generation of inner-city young people drop out of school, or graduate from school into the streets, joblessness, drugs and the dependency systems of welfare or prison. And it's a scandal that a society with children who need care, roads that need repair, bridges that need building is allowing and sometimes paying able men and women to sit idle. Unemployed workers and young people have been standing idle too long. Today, we have

workers, young and adult, in Pennsylvania, an& in other states ready to work on worthwhile projects. But somebody must ask them to serve. They need to be asked.

Where does this lead? It leads past the fruitless bickering about the Sixties and jumps back to the Thirties for some light on what worked in the Great Depression . . . and where we went wrong. What worked was the Civilian Conservation Corps that enlisted more than 2.5 million young unemployed Americans in residential, army-run camps in or on the edge of our parks and forests.

Just as FDR did in the Thirties, we could call on our military officers and noncommissioned officers to provide the leadership and teaching skills that are required. Today we have thousands of trained military personnel—skilled in the training of the young slated for early discharge because of changes in the world and our defense needs. We also have reservists and national guardsmen in search of new employment opportunities.

As Senator Nunn has pointed out, these men and women are a national resource who should not be wasted. We need their help to instill a new generation of young people with the sense of discipline and responsibility, teamwork and self-reliance that characterize not only our armed forces, but also our most productive workers and active citizens.

What worked with F.D.R. was work—not the dole, not welfare. Roosevelt said that the CCC camp program "has probably been the most successful thing we have ever done."

The young men of the CCC were challenged to achieve big goals. They transformed our parks and forests and then graduated into the National Service of World War II. More importantly, they transformed themselves. Just as the G.I. Bill after that war was one of the best investments America ever made, so was the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Roosevelt and Frances Perkins and the War Department (as it was then called), with the help of the departments of Labor, Agriculture and Interior, showed how fast and efficiently we can get action when we work together in this country. A week after first outlining the CCC idea, Roosevelt sent a message to Congress calling for its enactment. Two weeks later, March 31, 1933, Congress established the Civilian Conservation Corps in a simple, two-page act.

Roosevelt set a goal of 250,000 corpsmembers in camps by early summer. And by the end of July, there were 1,300 camps with over 300,000 men in the woods. One of the leaders in developing the CCC was the young Colonel George C. Marshall, who managed 17 camps in the southeast.

This is why I'm delighted to join forces with Senator Boren, the Chairman and other colleagues in developing the "Community Works Progress Act of 1992". The bill amends the Job Training Partnership Act to establish a community works progress program, a youth community corps program, and a national youth community corps program.

This is one idea that transcends politics, that goes beyond left or right, that draws on the liberal agenda and the conservative agenda at the same time. It is an idea that brings Arthur Ashe and General Schwartzkopf, Bill Buckley and Bill Clinton, Marian Wright Edelman and Father Hesburgh, together on the same platform . . . along with the memory of Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy and George Marshall.

Such Service Corps, in which the corpsmembers "serve, earn and learn" are an important part of the answer to the crisis of the young and the problem of welfare dependency. More than sixty such corps are in operation today around the country. Pennsylvania is proud to lead the way with the largest number of youth corps of all kinds. Every city, every community can develop one or more.

There have been enough pilot programs to prove that this approach works in the 90's as the CCC worked in the 30's. The time has come for the pilots to ignite the whole furnace. That is where this bill will help.

We must give people a chance to work. We must promote high performance work organizations, and encourage life-long training. Working together, we can accomplish this by challenging our young people to serve.

Later this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, you will hear from an outstanding leader of service corps from my state, Tony Fairbanks, who right now is enlisting young people into the service of their community.

Tony Fairbanks is the Executive Director of the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps. He knows first hand about the problems facing young people living in our cities and, more importantly, he knows how to combat these pressing problems.

He will tell you, in more dramatic terms than I can, that it *is* possible to break the cycle of dependency that too often continues from generation to generation. It *is* possible for young people to turn their lives around. It *is* possible for us to engage

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

those who are jobless—and hopeless—to transform their communities and their country, while helping themselves and their families. We know what to do. This legislation will help do it.

So I salute the Committee for its leadership and I look forward to working with you in giving a new generation of Americans the chance to serve and not be served. Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Senator Boren.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I must leave, but I want to explain to you gentlemen we will certainly give the bill careful consideration. We are glad to hear your views. I have to leave on account of another appointment. We may have a few questions we want to ask for the record, if you wouldn't mind doing that.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID L. BOREN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Senator BOREN. I appreciate the comments of our colleague from South Carolina. Let me say I hope that we will have a chance. I want to come by and talk with him about this because it is so important, I think as the Senator from Pennsylvania has just said, that we put people to work. We spent $900 billion on all forms of public assistance over the last eight years versus about $90 billion in current dollars on WPA and CCC, and look at the difference in terms of what we had to show for it. I think this is something we need to really build a bipartisan coalition around. So I thank him for his comments and his interest.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for calling this hearing and allowing us to air our feelings about this important issue. This is a moment of opportunity. You, as chairman of this subcommittee and as an individual Member of the Senate, along with other members of this committee, have taken the lead on this issue for a long time. Let me say in presenting this bill, I present it on behalf of many of us, and certainly on behalf of you as chairman of this committee and the long-term advocate of this idea.

I have no pride of authorship of this proposal. This is an idea that we obviously share with many people, including those that are at this table today, including yourself and many others in the Senate and in the broader community. We will be hearing from others. I have seen the distinguished mayor of Baltimore here and others who have been running very successful programs with first-hand experience who are far more expert than I.

This is a moment of great opportunity for us. I am especially pleased that Senator Warner, our colleague, has joined us as chief Republican cosponsor of this proposal. His support I think lends strength to it, and especially with his experience with military affairs at the time of transition from military to civilian programming, he will have more to say on this subject, I am sure, when we hear from him personally.

But because of what has happened in Los Angeles and because of it coming in the midst of an already beginning national debate on the welfare system and because of growing concern about the breakdown of families and the alienation of the young and because of concern about what we do to keep people gainfully employed and to meet the needs of the country and to harness the talent available to meet our domestic needs as we move from a military-driven

56-260 - 92 - 2

economy to one that will be less driven by that element of our economy, I think this is a proposal that has unique benefit. And it is my sincere hope that it will end up being included in whatever bipartisan package might be agreed between Congress and the administration and even in this Presidential election year. We can only hope that such a bipartisan agreement will come.

As the smoke clears in Los Angeles, we as a Nation face a clear picture of serious problems in our own society that we must not ignore. It is estimated that one out of every three children in the United States today will receive AFDC benefits before reaching the age of 18. One out of every three. The persistence of poverty in our inner cities and its consequences—from 80 percent of children being born out of wedlock to perhaps 20 percent of children in the inner cities being in family units that have neither parent present, to drug addition, to teenage pregnancy, to welfare dependency—all are tearing at the very fabric of our society.

If we can salvage only one lesson from the debris in Los Angeles, it must be this: We cannot afford to stand still. We cannot afford just to do more of the same. It is time to stop playing politics and pointing fingers, and start fixing problems. It is time to put into place policies that work instead of wasting time and throwing away money on those that don't.

While more resources will have to be invested, the solution is not as simple as increased funding for existing welfare and job training programs. In many ways, Los Angeles is just a magnifying glass for problems occurring throughout our Nation. Welfare rolls and unemployment rates are expanding at an alarming rate in both urban and rural areas. In the last two years alone, the number of people receiving AFDC benefits has gone up by 24 percent to 14.6 million people while benefits have been frozen or cut in over 40 States as they struggle with the increased budgetary burden of increased demands on the system. There are over 36 million people living at or below the poverty level; one in 10 Americans, one in 10 adult Americans, receiving food stamps. Clearly, our current system is not working. What is most needed is a change in our thinking and a new comprehensive approach which looks at what has worked in the past so that we can provide for the future.

If we are going to solve the problem of the urban crisis in this country, we need to work out way out of it, literally. In the 1930's, America addressed an economic and social crisis with a straightforward, action-oriented approach: the Works Progress Administration, the WPA, and Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC. As Senator Wofford has just said—and I have enormous respect for his personal commitment and experience in this area—what worked for FDR was work—not the dole, not welfare, but work, both in the WPA and the CCC.

During the 8 years the WPA was in existence in the late 1930's and early 1940's, 8 million WPA workers built more than 650,000 miles of roads, highways, and sidewalks, 125,000 public buildings, including 39,000 schools, 124,000 bridges, 8,000 parks and 18,000 playgrounds. They wrote hundreds of books, created countless artistic works. Young people in CCC planted hundreds of thousands of trees, for example. People in the WPA served over 1 billion meals to hungry schoolchildren and sewed over 380 million garments for

those in need in sewing rooms. All of this required an investment of about $90 billion in today's terms.

By comparison, what has our welfare system created in the last 8 years? Excluding Medicaid, in the last eight years we have spent between $400 and $500 billion on what people commonly call welfare. If all public assistance programs and cash transfers, including such things as Medicaid, are included in this figure, it reaches over $900 billion—$900 billion versus $90 billion of the 8 years of the WPA and the CCC. For these huge expenditures, we have managed to produce little more than subsistence-level payments to an increasingly hopeless and alienated segment of our society. By simply handing them checks, the system robs them of a sense of being part of the communities where they live and of any motivation to achieve. There is nothing worse for a person's sense of self-esteem than to have no reason to get out of bed in the morning and no useful work to perform.

We cannot afford to waste the talents of millions of Americans, most of whom want to give back, like the young man quoted by Senator Wofford, want to give back something of value to the community, have a deep desire to want to know that they have helped, that they have made a difference.

I will never forget talking to an elderly gentleman one day after a political speech in a football stadium in a small town in Oklahoma. He came up to me, took me by the hand, and said, "Senator, I want you to come over and see this wall of the stadium here." It was a rock wall. I followed him over, and he said, "I built it myself." He said, "It was part of the WPA." He said, "Look at it. There is not a crack in it today. It is not out of line one inch."

What he was really saying to me was: This is mine, I feel a part of it. I will bet he had never even thrown down a candy wrapper in that stadium. He feels a part of the community today because of something he contributed back to it.

Think about the contrast now, the feeling people have who simply receive a check in the mail. Perhaps it is an easier system, but it doesn't do the same thing for the people that receive it, and it certainly doesn't provide the benefit to the community as these earlier programs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert into the record two letters that I received that are just examples of hundreds I have received, both from people receiving public assistance and those who had experience under the programs of the 1930's.

Senator SIMON. They will be entered into the record.

[The letters follow:]

5924 S. PAULINA,
CHICAGO, IL 60636,
April 13, 1992.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC 20510.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON, I am writing to you about more jobs for the black youths. There are too many black unemployed people in the Chicago area. There should be more better paying jobs out here but it's not. And the jobs don't pay a good enough salary that you could live off of. The crime rate is so high, because young black teenagers have nothing else to do but be on the street corners and rob people for money that they could be making if the federal government would create public

service jobs. The federal government claims that they don't have enough money to create jobs, but they seem to have it to give to other countries like the former Soviet Union. I would like you to sponsor a bill for more public service jobs to help the people here in America.

Sincerely,

HENRY LONG.

May 4, 1992.

SENATORS DIXON, SIMON. As you can see I am not used to writing a letter like this as I don't know who to address this too.

Anyway, my subject is how to help the young people, black and white.

When I was 15-16 years old in New York, I was a misfit. I quit high school, hung around candy stores and smoked cigarettes and thought I was a big shot.

I might have gotten worse if I hadn't joined the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corp's). When I joined I weighed 116 lbs. I was in for about 1½ years. I came out weighing 138 and solid muscle and a complete different outlook on life. That was about 1939 when I was 17 years old. Since then I have raised three children by myself and have nine grand children. Never spent a day in jail. The worst I got was a speeding ticket. I am now 73 and feel great.

Now, the reason for this letter—if the CCCs could do that for me why haven't some of you people in power started something like that today? Please look into it. Thank you.

CHARLES H. PARENTE.

SHANNON STEIBEL,
RR 1 BOX 142,
Prairie du Rochu, IL 62277.

DEAR SENATOR SIMON. Hi. My name is Shannon Steibel. I am a student at Red Bud High School. I am working toward my Eagle Scout in my troop.

I am concerned about the job situation in our country, in our state and especially in our community. In March, my dad will lose his job at Inter City Products. He worked in this factory for 23 years.

It was bought out by a Canadian company. They decided they would close the one here in Red Bud instead of the one in Canada.

My question to you is how can you help this from happening again to some other family? Please reply.

Sincerely,

SHANNON STEIBEL.

PEOPLE'S PULPIT

(Thursday, January 9, 1992)

EVANS, SIMON URGED TO PUSH FOR JOBS PROGRAM

Dear Editor, The Argus: The following is an open letter to Congressman Lane Evans and Senator Paul Simon.

Sirs, the rise in this city's (Rock Island) murder and other violent crime rate during 1991 prompted me to make you aware of our local plight.

Honorable Mr. Evans and Mr. Simon, I urge you to present President George Bush our desperate need for a jobs program to put a dent into crime.

Recently a statement by the center for budget policy priorities listed the District of Columbia, Illinois, Michigan, Maryland, Massachusetts, California, Ohio and Maine as the state's which impose the most severe cuts in programs for the poor and unskilled.

Mr. Evans and Mr. Simon, unemployment is soaring higher in our city (Rock Island) and even higher in other cities in your respective districts. The federal government should put some kind of job program into effect to put some of our young adults to work to curb drug and related activity.

We need to find a way to use and assert these young minds in a positive way instead of a destructive way. People who don't have any job have a tendency to feed off each other. Gentlemen, this is what is happening Rock Island.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the past, your political actions and concern for citizens has been most rewarding. I solicit your continued input and judicial interest.

ANDREW C. JEFFERSON,
Alderman, First Ward,
Rock Island.

Senator BOREN. I will just quote one. This is from someone who is on welfare now, drawing assistance:

I applaud you for the changes you are trying to make in the welfare system. I am a long-time welfare recipient. I am not proud to admit it. Given the opportunity, I would definitely like to earn my living the right way. Currently, the system falls down in many ways. Taking handouts makes you feel insecure. You lose confidence, you lose interest, you become withdrawn, you become depressed, denial sets in. As a recipient for many years off and on, I think I can speak for many.

And the last sentence of the letter was:

I look forward to working again.

That is from someone who is on welfare. What about someone who had a different kind of experience during the 1930's? This is a letter I received from a gentleman in Watts, OK. He said:

I hope you will succeed in your effort to get our people back to work, and the 1930's concept is right on target. Becoming a taxpayer is much preferred to becoming a tax recipient. I spent a couple of years in the CCC and learned a good trade, along with doing some meaningful and useful work. I was a heavy-equipment operator, and we enjoyed working in the Soil Conservation Service work. I made a career out of heavy construction later on and have made a good living the rest of my life for myself and my family.

We need to get back to these kinds of programs that work. The modern version of the WPA and CCC would provide work opportunities for those who are on welfare or unemployed. It would, in the words of President Roosevelt, "preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destitution"—that is what we are doing now, subsistence, preserving their bodies, keeping people alive, a roof over their head, medical services provided at a bare level. But he said, "preserve not only their bodies, but also their self-respect, their self-reliance and courage and determination."

This new "Community WPA" would help create jobs for welfare recipients and the unemployed to help make them feel a part of the community. Our plan would put them back to work as productive members of society. All able-bodied welfare recipients, with the exception of women with small children and those who are enrolled in education and job training programs, would be required to take a job with the new Community WPA if they were unable to find jobs elsewhere and if jobs were offered by the WPA program. Individuals who do not maintain satisfactory progress in their educational programs or who have been in job training programs for longer than nine months would be moved into CWPA jobs. At least 25 percent of these jobs would be reserved on a voluntary basis for those who have been unemployed for at least five weeks and those not currently counted in official unemployment figures. Many young men, who are falling through the cracks in the current system because they never held a job entitling them to unemployment compensation or never received AFDC benefits and, therefore, have never been counted, would be given the opportunity to contribute to their communities.

The program would be administered by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration through the

State agencies which administer the Job Training and Partnership program. Local and State agencies, as well as private, nonprofit organizations, could apply for grants from the Community WPA. These projects could include areas such as infrastructure construction and maintenance, creation of parks, or community work such as law enforcement assistance, delivering meals to elderly people, working with the Red Cross Blood Bank, and many other projects.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has published two volumes containing 7,200 proposals for job projects which are ready to go right now. For instance, the towns of Frederick, Walters, and Duncan in Oklahoma have developed 10 possible projects—I have a list of them here—from creek and drainage improvement to construction of community all-purpose centers, to improvement and beautification of parks. All they need are labor power and adequate funding.

The CWPA will help our Nation restore its crumbling infrastructure and provide all participants with a compensation at least 10 percent higher than their current welfare or unemployment benefits.

In addition to the CWPA, there would be two youth programs that would provide work opportunities to high school students and young adults in exchange for educational benefits. One is a new Youth Community Corps which would enable students from 7th to 12th grades to work up to 250 hours per year in demanding community service projects. Students participating for six years could earn up to $10,000 in educational credits or elect to receive $5,000 cash upon graduation as an alternative.

The second division, the National Youth Community Corps, would create camps, or dormitory units in urban areas, for young people aged 15 to 22 to work on projects ranging from reforestation to auxiliary police work, to town beautification. Those who have not yet finished high school can enroll in summer programs, and those who are beyond the high school age would work in year-long programs.

With the continued downsizing of the military, old military bases and former military personnel could be put to good purpose and used to help house, supervise, and training young adults. A volunteer national youth corps would help get young people off the street while providing them with a real educational opportunity. It would help beef up law enforcement and rebuild our infrastructure.

It would also provide $10,000 in educational benefits for each year of service to be used for college or vocational school or other training. Non-high school graduates would be required to complete their high school GED diploma work during the program to be eligible for these bonuses. Educational benefits received under these programs would not reduce—and it is very important—would not reduce other financial aid they might be eligible to receive for higher education. We don't want to penalize them and take away other aid. We want to reward them for working.

Many of those out of work today lack the skills and training of those people who went to work back at the time of the WPA and the CCC. Many of them already had a skill; they were simply unemployed. There will, therefore, be an even greater need for supervisors who can help train workers as they work. The Army ran the

CCC in the 1930's, and now is a good opportunity for many of the talented people being forced into early retirement to take up this leadership role again. In addition, as Senator Warner said recently, military facilities that are slated for closing have already been paid for by the taxpayers. They should be put to good use. "Why not," he asked, "fill those empty bunks and dormitory barracks with young people who need a chance to work and whose talents are needed to rebuild America?" We have to reawaken our spirit of community in this country that has remained dormant too long. We have to invest more of our resources and our people. Let's give young Americans who are disadvantaged and disillusioned an incentive to become a productive part of society. Let's instill in them the ethic of hard work, reward them for providing service to their country, and give them accomplishments on which they can look back with pride, like that man who build the wall in the stadium.

It is time to recycle an approach that worked well in the past and modify it to current conditions. Instead of the growing division between taxpayers and welfare recipients, it is time to make all Americans part of the same team again. Too often we just talk about the problems instead of doing something about them. We need, Mr. Chairman, action. We have an opportunity—an opportunity that may not come again in the current crisis. America worked its way out of the crisis of the 1930's. Let's get to work and work our way out of it again today.

Senator SIMON. Thank you very, very much.

Before I call on my colleague, Senator Reid, Mayor Schmoke, I was handed a note, you have a 4 o'clock appointment with the Speaker, as I understand it. Is there any possibility of your returning after that to testify?

Mr. SCHMOKE. I will try my best.

Senator SIMON. All right. That would be great. We would appreciate it because we want to hear from you.

Our colleague, Senator Reid.

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY REID, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator REID. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. When we were in the House, we talked about legislation like this. I followed you to the Senate, and we introduced legislation that would have done something with unemployment. This is certainly an improvement on what we introduced previously.

I think we are getting closer to getting it right. I think this is really a step in the right direction.

I think that we need to dwell on the fact that we have approximately 10 million people right now who are drawing unemployment benefits in our country. This does not count those people who are not on the unemployment rolls for a lot of different reasons.

In Nevada alone, we have 45,600 workers who are unemployed, and over 8,700 of these men and women are receiving extended benefits. These extended benefits, only the extended benefits, have amounted to about $27.5 million through April. And, frankly, in exchange for that, these 14,200 people who have received this money, we have gotten nothing in exchange for it.

We have talked a little bit today about what we have spent the last eight years, and the figures are up here on the chart: $932.5 billion. For that we have literally gotten nothing; whereas, we have the costs for the WPA during a comparable period of time, and I think it is worth repeating some of the things we got during that period of time: 650,000 miles of roads. And, Mr. Chairman, I have here a few miles of those roads. It is a picture I would like you to see. This is the first road built into the forest area about 15 or 20 miles outside Las Vegas, the first road built into that area, a place called Kyle Canyon. It is beautiful. The road is still in existence. So these are not just statistics we are throwing around. These people, 50, 60 years ago, did real projects.

I have here in front of me the Nevada Supreme Court building. This was built by the Works Progress Administration. The Nevada Supreme Court was in that building for over 50 years. They just moved out within the past couple of months to a new building. Another State agency will use this beautiful building. It just got too small. We had a three-member court then; now we have a five-member court.

But the point of the matter is we talk about 650,000 miles of roads, we talk about 124,000 bridges. I have here in front of me two of the bridges that were build in Nevada. They are still there, Mr. Chairman. Those bridges were built. They are 2 of the 124,000 bridges. These are two bridges that are in the Reno area, and when I go home this next week, I will drive over these bridges. Almost 60 years old, they are still in a fine state of repair, comparable to the wall that Senator Boren talked about in Oklahoma. People are proud that they had something to do with those bridges, that supreme court building, and that road into Kyle Canyon.

We have talked, Senator Wofford and Senator Boren, about things that people did other than with their hands. One of my favorite people of all time—I wish I could have met him. I have studied him a lot. I have read his letters in the Library of Congress. That is Woody Guthrie. Many of the songs that he wrote were while he was on welfare. He was a welfare recipient, getting paid to write songs. And songs he wrote: "This Land Is My Land, This Land Is Your Land," "Roll On, Columbia," and many great songs, hundreds of them.

Studs Terkel, Saul Bellow, a Nobel Prize winner in literature, Jackson Pollack, many other writers, musicians, and artists were put to work under the Works Progress Administration. Talented writers contributed to the famous American Guide Series, which covered every State, many regions and cities. One man said of this project that these writers "uncovered an America that nothing in the academic histories had ever prepared one for."

The State of Nevada, as I have indicated, benefited tremendously from this project. I have talked just about a few of the things. Out of the 650,000 miles of roads, Nevada got 2,000 miles of those roads. We got 154 bridges, 60 schools. Probably the finest building, in my estimation, eve built in Nevada was built by the Works Progress Administration. We refer to it as the 5th Street Grammar School. That was a beautiful building, one of the first buildings built in the Las Vegas area using the Southwest architecture. That building is

still there. No longer is it a school. It is owned by Clark County, and they use it for administrative procedures.

So we, Mr. Chairman, have to understand that we need to put people to work. What we have created is not good. People are dignified by work. People are dignified by the fact that they can do something to contribute to society, and we need to do that.

Samuel Cohn, who was a WPA economics statistician, said, "People talk about leaf raking and say it was not very economic. It served a purpose. It made people feel more useful at a time when that was important."

Well, the things we are talking about having done, like in Henderson, NV, the only place we checked in Nevada, Henderson, NV, alone has 19 projects. These are not leaf-raking projects. These are ready to go, including the building of several parks, the extension of a highway, flood control, the building of a water treatment plant, and the rehabilitation of an old youth center. This is the town where I went to high school, Mr. Chairman. These projects would create about 1,200 jobs in Henderson during the first year. This one town could employ 13 percent of those currently receiving extended benefits in Nevada.

I hope that we do something, and there is a good representative body of Senators here in this room today. I hope we do something more than just talk about this. We have to prevail upon the Appropriations Committee to get a pilot project or two or three this year—not next year. Let's try to do something this year. Let's try to get a project that would be one in—you know, it doesn't have to come to Nevada. It doesn't have to go to Chicago. It doesn't have to go to Oklahoma or Virginia or Pennsylvania. I will gladly give up a project in the State of Nevada, but we need to have these projects. And I think the first place we should start are in the inner cities. I just hope, I repeat, that we do something more than talk about it.

This concept is long overdue. We know it worked in the past. We don't need to reinvent the wheel. Let's just do something that proved good at one time. It is still good.

[The prepared statement of Senator Reid follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR REID

Recently, Senator Boren and I, and a number of other Senators, introduced the Community Works Progress Act of 1992. The jobless rate in this country is not showing much improvement. The latest figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show almost 9.15 million workers are without jobs. This makes the unemployment rate 7.2 percent.

In Nevada alone, 45,600 workers are unemployed and over 8,700 men and women are receiving extended benefits. These extended benefits alone have amounted to $27.3 million through April, with over 14,200 workers having received it.

And what are we getting for that money? The answer is: nothing. Are the unemployed being retrained? Are we using their talents in productive ways? No, we are not.

The current welfare system in America is demeaning. We make people take handouts. Nobody wants a handout. People want to live productive lives.

In an 8-year period, FY 83 to FY 90, the federal government handed out $932.5 billion to welfare recipients. That's almost a trillion dollars! And what do we have to show for it?

In another 8-year period, 1935 to 1943, a different kind of welfare program, the Works Progress Administration, spent $11 billion, which would be about $90 billion in today's money. And what did we get to show for this welfare program?

We got the following: 651,000 miles of highways and roads, 124,000 bridges, 39,000 schools built or improved, 8,000 parks, 18,000 playgrounds and athletic fields, 1,000

libraries, and almost 600 airports to name just part of what the American people got in return for this welfare program. The participants also constructed power lines in rural areas, planted millions of trees, exterminated rats in slum areas, and organized nursery schools. This program gave work to about 8.5 million Americans, including some very famous Americans.

Woody Guthrie, Studs Terkel, Saul Bellow (a Nobel Prize winner in literature), Jackson Pollack, and a number of other writers, musicians, and artists were put to work under the WPA.

Many talented writers contributed to the famous American Guide Series, which covered every state, and many regions and cities. Alred Kazin said of this project that these writers "uncovered an America that nothing in the academic histories had ever prepared one for."

The State of Nevada benefited greatly from this project. Over 2,000 miles of roads were built or improved, 154 bridges built, 60 schools built or reconstructed, 39,000 feet of runway were built or improved, and many other projects were undertaken.

Other works programs during the Great Depression completed Boulder Dam, built the Tennessee Valley Authority, and finished New York City's Triborough Bridge.

Today, we still cross bridges these workers made, attend their schools, ride on their roads, and use the public buildings they either built or decorated with murals. And the $250 million the WPA spent refurbishing Army and Navy facilities proved ironically useful in the short term.

As important as anything the WPA built, this agency boosted the morale of Americans by giving them a chance to avoid the humiliation of being on relief. Samuel Cohn, who was a WPA economics statistician, said, "People talk about leaf-raking and say it was not very economic. It served a purpose. It made people feel more useful at a time when that was important."

None of the projects that will be funded under this bill need be "make-work" projects. I recently received two volumes called "Ready to Go, A Survey of USA Public Works Projects to Fight the Recession Now." This publication is put out by the United States Conference of Mayors. This publication contains responses front 506 cities, listing 7,252 projects that are ready-to-go and could create 418,415 jobs in 1992 alone.

The city of Henderson, Nevada, alone has 19 projects ready to go, including the building of several parks, the extension of a highway, flood control, the building of a water treatment plant, and the rehab of their Youth Center. These projects could create 1,182 Jobs in Henderson in 1992. This one town could employ 13 percent of those currently receiving extended benefits in Nevada.

There is work to do; there are people to do it. So, let's put the two together. Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will move swiftly on this bill and report it favorably.

Senator SIMON. We thank you very much for your common sense, Senator Reid.

Senator Warner, nice to have you join us here.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. WARNER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Senator WARNER. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I am going to ask that my statement be submitted.

Senator SIMON. It will be entered in the record.

Senator WARNER. I am just going to reminisce a bit and give a few thoughts.

I find that this is an exciting moment in my Senate career to sit here at the table with three other colleagues for whom I have the greatest respect and have worked on a diversity of projects through many years: the Intelligence Committee with my friend, Dave Boren; the Environment Committee with my chairman; and Senator Wofford and I, we formed a friendship under unusual circumstances, but we are good friends.

I predict we become the four horsemen, and we are going to get this thing across the goal line. I am not sure exactly how it is going

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to go or what form it will take, but I just predict we are going to carry it across.

I would like to take a minute as to why I want to be a part of this team. I have just finished a statewide tour of the major cities with my Governor, Governor Wilder. We teamed up and held town meetings, and I will never forget one night around 9:30 there was an elderly minority gentleman, gray hair, and he sat and listened for some time, and he stood up and he said, "I have devoted my life now to young people." He was in his 70's. And he told about his days in the CCC, and suddenly there was a flashback in my own life because I was raised in the period as a young man of the CCC and the WPA. Really my first job was with the Forest Service in the summer of 1943. I traveled out to the Montana-Idaho border, and we went into a CCC camp, which had just been vacated a short time before as they went on into the Army.

There was a small library there that was left by the hastily departing CCC fellows, and in it was a little diary written by one of the members of the CCC in that camp in his own handwriting. And I fell heir to the diary, and I read it. And it was a very moving story. I only wish that I could find it today.

But I have heard that story here in the testimony of these colleagues. And so I am going to do what I can to make this happen, and I will add one other reason. The first CCC camp, based on my quick research, was in a little town called Edinburg, VA. It started there when George Marshall, one of our distinguished citizens of the Commonwealth, put it there. And I today live just a short distance from it, and I remember it very well.

I also have talked with Secretary Cheney and Secretary Martin, Labor Department, and I was surprised to see how much work is going on in those two departments to determine how we can marshal our resources to get behind this concept. The administration as yet has not reached a position, but I get the feeling that if we can come up with something construction, they will take a good hard look at it.

As we look at this problem—and we are on the floor right now trying to come up with solutions—it is money. And I feel that we can, as Senator Boren said, begin to look at what resources are available today; i.e., a reduced military posture, reduced camps and bunks, and not only that, the people on active duty I think will take an interest, a tremendous interest in this program.

Also, I have a vivid recollection of one other thing. We pointed out these buildings, and that is the first reason that this program will succeed, because those buildings, those roads, those bridges have withstood the test of time and are still functional and usable today. But the WPA and the CCC passed another test which was a lot tougher in iron and steel and architecture, and that was humor. Believe me, those two programs were the butt of every joke, every cartoon in America—in the beginning. But as the war came on, it was less and less because those who went into the program finally turned the tide of criticism and proved that this thing could work.

So in two ways I think this program has passed the test, and now we can just go back and do what we can to make it work once again, and I pledge my commitment to work with my colleagues.

I will close with one other thing. You mentioned, Senator, the diversity of what these people did. One other contribution: They were very active in art, and there is quite a bit of it to be found on the walls and elsewhere in America today. Let me tell you, that art could pass the toughest of tests in the NEA and even the United States Senate.

Thank you.

Senator SIMON. I thank you, and I thank all four, if I may refer to you as the four horsemen.

Senator BOREN. Mr. Chairman, we must add the fifth, because the chairman is——

Senator SIMON. I would be happy to be the fifth.

Senator BOREN. —the originator of this proposal.

Senator SIMON. Let me just add one comment because my colleague, Senator Thurmond, for whom I have great respect, mentioned the average cost would be $18,900 a job. Under this program, the person working four days a week at the minimum wage would get $535 a month. That would be $6,420 a year if you work every week, and we have a limit of 10 percent of administrative costs here. So you are talking just over $7,000 a job.

Senator REID. Mr. Chairman, the thing we tend to always not talk about is we are paying money anyway.

Senator SIMON. I was just going to get to that point. We are going to pay people either for being productive or non-productive. It just seems to me it makes so much more sense to pay people for being productive and to give them pride in what they are doing.

Senator WARNER. And self-respect.

Senator SIMON. That is exactly right.

Senator WARNER. That is the key. As my colleague said over here, dignity and self-respect. We cannot cost that out.

Senator REID. Mr. Chairman, if I could just say one thing? I called a relative of mine in Nevada over the weekend, and I ended the conversation not happy. I am sure he didn't realize it. He proceeded to tell me——

Senator SIMON. He realizes it now. Maybe it is on television.

Senator REID. He proceeded to tell me that some people were living in his house. I said, "Well, what are they doing?" He said, "Oh, nothing. They are just drawing unemployment, laying back, kicking their heels up."

That is how, sadly, some people look at unemployment. And I was thinking of our legislation. That is not the way it should be. Drawing unemployment compensation should not be a vacation time, and I think that this legislation would put an end to that.

Senator SIMON. And it really lifts people in the process.

Senator WOFFORD. You know, there is an interesting point, Mr. Chairman, I found in reading the original Civilian Conservation Corps Act. It is the first time in any Federal program that I noted a provision in 1933, long before the Army practiced this, that there shall be no discrimination by race or color.

Senator SIMON. That is very interesting. I think Senator Warner made a very important point in the cultural contribution that these made to our Nation. Just very, very great.

Well, I thank you now. Senator Boren?

Senator BOREN. Mr. Chairman, one other point that I want to make for the record because, as you begin, as a package is put together with a lot of other elements, which we hope this will be part of it, I think clearly this is complementary to other programs that we have going. In other words, it is not a substitution for the jobs initiative, for example, which really gets people into education and training. Some of these people are not even really ready for educational programs yet. They have never had a work experience at all. And when you look at the history of the programs that are working at the grass roots, especially dealing with people that have had no work experience at all, no environment in which some discipline of getting up and getting out at a certain hour of the morning.

The thing we found from these studies and these tests, California and New York among two, is that if you get someone out into a work experience, that is the most important thing in terms of the life-changing experience. Then they are more ready for education; they are more ready for training; they are ready to be cycled into the private sector. Some of these people are not yet ready to go into the private sector.

So I look at this as something that is very complementary to the jobs program, as we call it now, which is basically mainly aimed at an education and training program, at private sector initiatives. It is not at all inconsistent with private sector initiatives. I am an author of the targeted jobs tax credit and other programs that encourage private sector employers to hire people who have been disadvantaged. This gets them ready for that kind of program to transition them.

We are also not reinventing the wheel. We are running this through the Department of Labor JTPA structure that is already there, the private industry councils that are already there at the local level, the State agencies that are already there. This is not going to create a new layer of bureaucracy, and I think that is something that really needs to be made clear. It is not competing with other proposals that may come out. It is filling a void that I think that remains there that needs to be filled for all these other things to work as well.

Senator SIMON. Let me just add that Senator Boren and I and our staff have discussed how we frame this proposal. I think what we have to do is to have three or four urban areas. We are, frankly, not going to be able to have a national program, but pick three or four urban areas, maybe a similar number of rural poor areas, maybe an Indian reservation or two, and let's see what we can do and learn, and then hopefully we will learn that everyone benefits, and then we can move into a national program.

My thanks again to all four of you.

Senator WOFFORD. As we leave, may I welcome Tony Fairbanks who will be testifying shortly, the executive director of the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps who headed the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. He is an outstanding leader in this very field.

Senator SIMON. Great.

Our next panel: Eileen Sweeney, the director of Government Affairs of the Children's Defense Fund. And we appreciate what the

Children's Defense Fund is doing. You have been absolutely magnificent.

Kathleen Selz, the executive director of the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, which is working in this area.

We have already heard twice about you. You have really had the introduction here, Mr. Fairbanks. Anthony Fairbanks, executive director of the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps.

Mickey Kaus is listed here as the senior editor of The New Republic. He has written more in this jobs area than anyone in the United States today, and he has a new book coming out—when?

Mr. KAUS. This summer.

Senator SIMON. This summer on this whole question.

And Frank Slobig, the director of policy and programs for Youth Service America.

I might just mention in advance, if Mayor Schmoke comes back, wherever we are, I may interrupt the testimony at that point to hear the mayor of Baltimore so we can get his testimony in here also.

We are very pleased to have all of you. Unless there is some preference, I am just going to start with you, Ms. Sweeney, at the end, and then we will go through. We will enter your full statements in the record. You proceed as you wish to. If we can limit it to five minutes so we can have more conversation, we would appreciate that. That is what these little lights will mean.

STATEMENTS OF EILEEN SWEENEY, DIRECTOR GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND; ANTHONY R. FAIRBANKS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PHILADELPHIA YOUTH SERVICE CORPS; FRANK SLOBIG, DIRECTOR OF POLICY AND PROGRAMS, YOUTH SERVICE AMERICA; MICKEY KAUS, SENIOR EDITOR, THE NEW REPUBLIC, AND AUTHOR, "THE END OF EQUALITY"; AND KATHLEEN SELZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SERVICE AND CONSERVATION CORPS

Ms. SWEENEY. Thank you, Senator Simon. I appreciate your kind words about CDF, and we also very much appreciate all your efforts on behalf of the poor and trying to find job opportunities and create job opportunities at the Federal level. In the last few weeks, obviously this issue has come to the forefront, but you have been working on this issue for a very long time when it wasn't the hot issue. We very much appreciate your efforts in this area.

CDF strongly supports the central thrust of the Community Works Progress Act; that is, the creation of work opportunities for jobless Americans when jobs are not otherwise available in the private or public sectors. The violence in Los Angeles has many causes, but surely the lack of hope and opportunity for many who reside in its impoverished neighborhoods fueled much of the frustration and rage that exploded so tragically on the streets of that city. CDF believes that the creation of jobs for those who are shut out of the labor force and do not have the opportunity to participate in any meaningful way in the American Dream is an essential Federal response to the problems of America's urban areas.

I would like to move to just a couple of suggestions we would have for ways in which the bill could be improved. Our main con-

cern is in the area of assuring that people receive equal pay for equal work, and we are concerned that by building the system on the AFDC benefit or the UI benefit the person is receiving, plus 10 percent, that you are effectively going to end up with a system that results in incredible inequities of two people working next to each other receiving very different pay for the same jobs. We recognize that the minimum wage has been put in as a floor, and that is very important. But at the same time, because AFDC tends to be predominantly women receiving the benefits, whereas UI is both men and women, it is very possible that you could be in a situation where you would have women being paid much less for doing exactly the same work as men. So we would urge you to look at that and see if there are ways through these demonstrations to change that approach.

Senator SIMON. And if I may just interrupt—we will give you a little extra time here for interrupting—any specific suggestions you have here, we would welcome. It is a very difficult problem because what we want to do is to encourage people to move from unemployment compensation into jobs like this. But you can't very well do it without giving them some increment over what they are now getting. So this is an area where any concrete suggestions you have would help—we see the problem more than we see a good concrete answer.

Ms. SWEENEY. I appreciate there aren't easy answers to the question. In fact, one of the things that has been tricky about the way it is set up in the bill is that because there are so many different AFDC levels even within one State, depending on the number of children in the family, and UI varies as well based on the wage record of the individual, it would be easier, in fact, to go to a regular wage structure than to one in which you have everybody getting something different. The administrative nightmare there could be very substantial.

We also think it is very important that people get a paycheck instead of a welfare check out of this. And the way, as I understand, that it is set up right now, you still get your welfare check or your UI check and then 10 percent, rather than getting a paycheck. And that is probably the biggest, most important thing you can do, I think, in this area of dignity and respect and self-worth, is that you walk home with a paycheck every week rather than that welfare check.

The other concern we have which I think is easily taken care of is that for AFDC recipients the jobs provisions, which I know will continue to be in place, really need to be kept in place through the program. All those good transitional provisions for Medicaid and chid care need to stay in place while the person's in this program, as well as when they make that leap into another job in the private or public sector, a real concrete job, that they are really going to need that child care there for that 12-month period the way it currently exists in the jobs program. I think that is something that is pretty easily solved, and it would make a big difference for a lot of people.

Subtitle C of the bill, which establishes a Youth Community Corps program for in-school youth, also could expand opportunities for community service available to some groups of young people.

We are concerned, however, that where a youth comes from a very low-income family and needs money now that the ability to wait to receive either educational credits or cash a number of years down the road really isn't a realistic option for them. As a result, if there is some way to change that to get youth into this where they can also bring some money home to help out the family, that would also be very important.

Finally, let me stress once again CDF's appreciation for the efforts of you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Boren in bringing this bill forward. It really makes a big difference, I think, both in the debate on urban aid and also on welfare reform and really is where the focus should be.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Sweeney follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MS. SWEENEY

Good afternoon. I am Eileen Sweeney, director of government affairs for the Children's Defense Fund (CDF). I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee to testify on S. 2373, the Community Works Progress Act of 1992.

I would be remiss if I did not begin by expressing CDF's appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for your tireless efforts over many years to advance federal efforts to create work opportunities for jobless Americans. While the jobs issue suddenly has been pushed to the forefront of the national agenda by the events in Los Angeles several weeks ago, we are well aware of how difficult it has been during the past decade to draw attention to the shortage of work opportunities for millions of youths and adults in our impoverished inner cities and depressed rural areas. We are most grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership in this area during a time when it has been neither fashionable nor expedient to be a champion for the unemployed.

CDF strongly supports the central thrust of the Community Works Progress Act—the creation of work opportunities for jobless Americans, including but not limited to AFDC recipients, when jobs are not otherwise available in the private or public sectors. The violence in Los Angeles has many causes, but surely the lack of hope and opportunity for many who reside in its impoverished neighborhoods fueled much of the frustration and rage that exploded so tragically on the streets of that city. CDF believes that the creation of jobs for those who are shut out of the labor force and unable to participate in any meaningful way in the American dream is an essential federal response to the problems of America's urban areas.

By providing employment of up to 32 hours per week for AFDC recipients, individuals receiving unemployment insurance (UI) benefits, and discouraged workers, S. 2373 revives and builds upon an approach which served the nation well more than half a century ago. The basic wisdom of the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1330's lay in their recognition of the fundamental importance and value of work. Yet in recent years, despite strong public support for measures that put jobless Americans back to work, we have all but abandoned this essential goal.

Job creation long has been the missing link in welfare reform debates. Even the recently enacted Family Support Act, while authorizing federal funds for education, training, and supportive services (such as child care and transportation), ignored the need for jobs in areas of high unemployment. As a result, economically depressed communities and regions often are stymied in their efforts to help AFDC recipients move off the welfare rolls. With modifications, S. 2373 can respond to this glaring hole in current welfare reform efforts by offering AFDC recipients the dignity and benefits of useful work in their communities as an alternative to continued reliance upon welfare.

The provision of genuine employment opportunities through S. 2373 stands in sharp contrast to welfare reform proposals that rely heavily upon community work experience (CWEP) programs, in which AFDC recipients are assigned to unpaid work activities in public or private non-profit agencies. CWEP offers neither the dignity nor the financial incentives that accompany real jobs. Research evidence also suggests that CWEP yields little or no gains in future employability for AFDC recipients, while imposing large administrative costs on state and local governments.

The primary goal of federal welfare policy must be to increase job opportunities for AFDC recipients who are able to work so they can move off welfare and eventually lift their families out of poverty. S. 2373 represents an important first step toward this goal. In contrast, expanded CWEP programs would open no new doors of opportunity for AFDC recipients and might derail current state efforts to provide essential education and training services under the Family Support Act.

As originally introduced, however, a few provisions of S. 2373 also raise some serious concerns. Most important, the bill seems to deny participants equal pay for equal work by tying wages to the level of benefits that individuals received prior to entering the program. This approach is both inequitable and unworkable. In its consideration of S. 2373, we strongly urge the Subcommittee to craft wage provisions that honor the nation's longstanding commitment to the principle of equal pay for equal work, preserve the federal minimum wage floor, and minimize threats to the wage levels and job security of other public sector employees.

Section 616 of the bill mandates that AFDC or UI recipients who participate in community works progress projects would continue to receive their AFDC or UI benefits and be paid an additional amount equal to 10 percent of those benefits for their work effort (although no participant could receive a total payment less than the amount that would be generated by work at the minimum wage). This wage structure virtually ensures that individuals working side by side in community works progress projects will receive substantially different levels of compensation for their labors. Because AFDC benefits typically are much lower than UI benefits and AFDC recipients are overwhelmingly female, women who participate in these projects are particularly likely to receive lower wages for the same work performed by their male counterparts.

The administrative complexity of this wage structure offers further reason for considering alternative approaches. AFDC and UI benefits both vary from family to family, necessitating separate wage calculations for each participant and requiring projects to gain access to detailed AFDC and UI records. In addition, AFDC benefits typically fluctuate from month to month as family circumstances or other sources of income change. These variations would complicate greatly any attempt to tie compensation to monthly AFDC or UI benefits.

I also should emphasize that the compensation provisions of S. 2373 as currently drafted would prevent participants in community works progress projects from moving off the AFDC or UI rolls by virtue of their employment. One of the most obvious benefits of any federal job creation effort is the prospect of replacing a welfare check with a paycheck. Yet the current bill keeps participants on the AFDC or UI rolls, offering only a very modest supplement to their normal benefits.

These concerns regarding equity and administrative complexity can be remedied by severing the link between prior benefits and wages in the community works progress projects. Giving participants a paycheck rather than a supplement to AFDC or UI benefits will allow projects to preserve the principle of equal pay for equal work, vastly simplify program administration, and reduce the numbers of Americans relying upon AFDC or UI for basic income support.

While the legislation should establish parameters for wages paid in community works progress projects, no single wage level will be appropriate for all states or communities. The federal minimum wage provides the obvious floor beneath which wages in these projects should not be allowed to fall. However, states (and possibly individual service delivery areas at the local level) should be permitted to pay modestly higher wages when necessary to reflect regional differences in the cost of living or to avoid situations in which participants would be paid substantially less than regular public sector employees engaged in similar work.

S. 2373 already gives states and communities broad discretion in designing projects that engage participants in useful work, including human service activities as well as community or neighborhood improvement efforts. It should provide similar leeway to states and communities in setting wage levels paid to participants, perhaps up to a maximum of 175 percent or 200 percent of the federal minimum wage. For participants who move off the AFDC rolls as a result of their earnings under this program, states also should be required to extend transitional child care and Medicaid benefits to include both the period of their participation in a community works progress project as well as the 12 months following their participation in those cases when they move into unsubsidized employment. Without an extension of these benefits, many participants will have exhausted their eligibility for essential transitional supports before they find and get established in permanent jobs in the private or public sectors.

With a more workable and equitable wage structure and essential transitional benefits, the work opportunities provided under S. 2373 could make a huge differ-

ence for out-of-school youths as well as unemployed adults. Subtitle C of the bill, establishing a Youth Community Corps program for in-school youths, also could expand opportunities for community service available to some groups of young people. However, we are concerned that many youths from low-income families that need immediate income would be precluded from participating in youth community corps projects because of the program's emphasis on educational credits rather than cash payments and the deferral of compensation until service in a given project is completed.

Finally, the proposal to establish a new residential program for youths as envisioned in Subtitle D of S. 2373 should be considered carefully in light of competing priorities. The federal government's major residential education and training programs for disadvantaged youths, the Job Corps, has established an impressive track record over nearly three decades. Proposals to expand the Job Corps substantially by opening 50 new centers across the country are now pending in Congress. CDF urges the Subcommittee to consider the merits of this Job Corps expansion in assessing the appropriateness of establishing a new residential youth program at this time.

In closing, let me stress once again CDF's appreciation for the efforts that the Chairman of this Subcommittee and Senator Boren have made to bring the Community Works Progress Act to the forefront of today's debates on urgently needed urban aid and reforms of the current welfare system. Particularly at a time when so many political leaders at federal and state levels are attempting to blame AFDC recipients themselves for the rising welfare caseloads and costs that have accompanied the current recession, this focus on job creation is desperately needed.

CDF is eager to continue working with the Subcommittee to make necessary modifications to S. 2373 and build support for this important legislation in the Congress. Thank you.

Senator SIMON. Thank you very much.

Mr. Fairbanks, you have a reputation to live up to here now, after all this. Your testimony had better be pretty good.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Well, Senator, I certainly appreciate Senator Wofford's introduction of me earlier. My specific comments about the bill will be incorporated with my colleague Kathleen Selz' comments, representing the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps. I want to spend my brief time talking about a specific program in the city of Philadelphia that I truly believe works. That program is called the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps.

In Philadelphia, every day the newspapers are full of stories decrying horrible, vicious, inhuman act perpetrated by some of our young people. These same young people who are preying on others—our elderly, our women, our children, destroying neighborhoods—are, indeed, themselves being preyed upon. In the summer of 1991, over a 30-day period beginning midway through June through midway through July, 40 youngsters between the ages of 4 and 19 were either seriously wounded or killed, for the most part caught in gun battles through the drug trade. The city was devastated by this, and we decided to do something about it.

The Department of Labor and Industry, then headed by Senator Harris Wofford, and the Private Industry Council of Philadelphia, headed by Patricia Irving, and the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps decided to expand the concept of community service. Why community service? Because we know without a doubt that many of these same young men and women, capable of doing such horrible things, are also capable of doing some wonderful things. Bond them into the community in an environment of rigid discipline. Make sure that they have contact with family, church, mentors, supervisors that extends beyond the workday. Give them contact with successful men, black and white, Asian and others, mentors from

churches, or coaches or businessmen, who encourage them when they are down, challenge them, and believe in them.

The Philadelphia Youth Service Corps is a youth program that serves 400 to 500 young people a year through its year-round summer corps and wilderness challenge programs. The corps operates as a best practice model, whose components are: physical training, which provides structure and discipline to young people; academic instruction, which enhances basic academic skills, but even more than that, allows young people who have made a decision to drop out of school to re-enroll in school and to acquire their GED or their high school diploma; and community service, engaging young people in meaningful, tangible work in the very neighborhoods in which they reside.

The Corps is much more than that, though, Senator. It is much more than three basic components—physical training, academic enhancement, and community service. It is a program that says to young people for the first time in their lives that if you are behind in a race, the only way in which you can catch up is to run faster and run longer than your peers.

Corps members start each day at 7:30 a.m. in the morning and do not conclude the day until 6 o'clock in the evening. That is 10-and-a-half hours per day, Monday through Friday, and then on Saturday they must volunteer. They must volunteer.

Now, somebody told me that was an oxymoron. How can you possibly make people volunteer? But what I can say to you is that in the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps, the environment is such that they, indeed, volunteer to spend more time with us on Saturday because they do know, indeed, that they are behind in the race and that the only way to win it is to work harder.

It is a program that also says to our young people that excuses are tools of incompetence, they build monuments to nothing, and those who use them rarely amount to anything. Therefore, if you want to get ahead in life, do not make excuses.

The point is the Corps does not accept excuses as obstacles to success. We don't accept that you cannot come to work because you have no one to take care of your children. We provide access to child care services. We do not accept the fact that you may have some personal problems which may negatively impact upon your tenure in the program. We provide full-time personal and crisis counseling. We don't accept the lack of self-esteem as a reason for not being motivated to succeed. We provide a self-esteem-building experience called "the Hard Corps Challenge" that every Corps member must complete. In addition, throughout the Corps' experience are self-esteem-building activities.

Senator I want to be very clear on this point. Youth Corps are not poverty programs. They are not court-mandated programs. They are no-nonsense programs where young people are challenged to be of service to others. And should they stop being of service to others, they cannot participate. The Philadelphia Youth Service Corps' termination rate is 35 percent.

For many Corps members, the Corps functions not only as a second chance, but also as their family—a place where Corps members belong and are missed when they are not present; a place where everyone is accepted; a place where everyone has individual

and collective responsibilities; a place where expectations are clear and fair.

Corps build community support and buy-in by tackling projects that are of obvious value to the community, projects such as rehabilitating abandoned houses, revitalizing community recreation centers, and providing service to senior citizens.

Senator there is a small program in the city of Philadelphia that, indeed, is working. Its name is the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps. It is completing, on average, 60 major projects a year and an additional 100 smaller projects throughout the neighborhoods of Philadelphia. It is graduating young people who are going on to college or directly into private industry and who are doing well.

We want to do more. We need your help to do so. The Community Works Progress Act of 1992 is a step in this direction. I thank you for it.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fairbanks follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. FAIRBANKS

This afternoon, you have heard many eloquent speeches attesting to the plight of youth in America. Their speakers' poignant remarks have been both piercing and painful. The demographic and profiles of psycho-social profiles of the youth have one commonality—it is as if each speaker is talking about your neighborhood or mine.

In Philadelphia, every day the front pages of our newspapers are full of stories describing horrible, vicious, inhumane acts perpetrated by young people. And the same young people who are preying on others—our elderly, our women, our childre—are themselves being preyed upon. In the summer of 1991, over a 30-day period, 40 youngsters between the ages of 4 and 19 were either seriously wounded or killed. The city was devastated by this tragedy. And we decided to do something about it.

The Department of Labor and Industry, then headed by Senator Harris Wofford; and the Private Industry Council of Philadelphia, headed by Patricia Irving; and the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps; decided to expand the concept of community service. Why community service? Because we know that many of these same young men and women capable of doing such horrible things, are also capable of doing wonderful things. Bond them into the community in an environment of rigid discipline. Make sure that they have contact with family, church, mentors, supervisors that extends beyond the workday. Give them contact with successful black men—mentors from churches, or coaches, or businessmen—encourage them when they're down, challenge them, believe in them.

The Philadelphia Service Corps (PYSC) is a youth service program that serves 400 to 500 youth a year through its year round, summer corps and wilderness challenge programs. The Corps operates as a best practice model, whose components are physical training—which provides structure and discipline to young people; academic instruction—which enhances basic academic skills, but even more than that, allows young people to acquire their GED or high school diploma; community service—engaging young people in meaningful, tangible work *in the very neighborhoods in which they reside.*

The Corps is much more than that. It's a program that says to people for the first time in their lives that if you are behind in a race, the only way in which you can catch up is to run faster and longer than your peers.

Corpsmembers start race day at 7:30 in the morning and do not conclude the day until 6:00 in the evening. That is 10.5 hours per day, 5 days a week. And then on Saturday, they *must* volunteer.

It's a program that says, "excuses are tools of incompetence, they build monuments to nothing." Therefore, if you want to get ahead, do not make excuses. The point is, the Corps does not accept excuses as obstacles to success. We don't accept that you cannot come to work because you have no one to take care of your children—we provide access to child care services. We do not accept the fact that you may have some personal problems which may negatively impact upon your tenure in the program—we provide full-time personal and crisis counseling. We don't accept the lack of self esteem as a reason for not being motivated to succeed—we

provide a self esteem-building experience called the "hard corps challenge" that every corpsmember must complete. In addition, integrated throughout the Corps experience are self esteem-building activities.

Youth corps are not poverty programs, and they are not court-mandated programs. They are no-nonsense programs where young people are challenged to be of service to others—and should they stop being of service to others, they can not participate. The Philadelphia Youth Service Corps' termination rate is 35%.

For many corpsmembers, the Corps functions not only as a "second chance" but also as their family—a place where corpsmembers belong and are missed when not present; a place where everyone is accepted; a place where everyone has individual and collective responsibilities; a place where expectations are clear and fair.

Corps build community support and buy-in by tackling projects that are of obvious value to the community—projects such as rehabilitating abandoned housing; revitalizing community recreation centers; providing service to senior citizens.

Senator, there is a small program in the city of Philadelphia that is working. It is completing, on average, 60 major projects a year, and an additional 100 smaller projects throughout the neighborhoods of Philadelphia. It's graduating young people who are going on to college or directly into private industry, and who are doing well. I call your attention to an article in the Thursday, May 14, Philadelphia Daily News as evidence of the success of the program.

We want to do more. We need your help to do so.

Senator SIMON. We thank you very much, Mr. Fairbanks.

Mr. Slobig.

Mr. SLOBIG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The features of S. 2373 which most interest those of us in the youth service field are subtitles C and D, the Youth Community Corps Program and the National Youth Community Corps Program. Members of our staff have worked closely with your staff and that of Senators Simon and Boren up to this point in helping to draft the bill, and we will continue to be available to assist in whatever way we can. We hope that you will accept our observations and recommendations today as constructive commentary on the bill to date.

The leadership of the youth service field is delighted at the initiative of Senator Boren and yourself and initial list of cosponsors who have joined in support of S. 2373, all of whom were cosponsors of the National and Community Service Act, or at least voted for it, an Act which we organizationally and a number of other organizations worked long and hard for its passage, an important and yet modestly funded new Federal initiative that enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Senate.

Senator Wofford is the only one who didn't. He wasn't here. Had he been here, I am sure he would have been leading the charge. Clearly he has become, since his stunning election, a singular and steadfast supporter of youth service initiatives. His experience and track record in Pennsylvania, as Tony can attest, as Secretary of Labor and Industry is an enormous asset to the Senate and to this committee. What he accomplished with the job training system in Pennsylvania in the last four years promoting the development of a decentralized network of youth service corps is unparalleled. Pennsylvania has made the youth corps and job training connection significant and substantial, and they should be imitated by every other State in the country.

As someone who spent 10 years in the Federal Labor Department from 1971 to 1981 overseeing work and welfare programs and youth employment and training programs, I have some serious concerns about S. 2373 being tied to the Labor Department and the

JTPA system. I would strongly urge that subtitles C and D be recast as amendments to the National and Community Service Act and that the new programs authorized be administered by the Commission on National and Community Service. Programmatically what S. 2373 proposes to establish is far more consistent with and complementary to the programs authorized under subtitle B, part 1 and subtitle C of the National and Community Service Act than they are with JTPA.

It is true that the Commission on National and Community Service is a new independent Federal agency whose first round of grants is only now about to be made. It doesn't have the established Federal network and structure that the JTPA system has, but that may be an asset rather than a liability.

What it does have is a growing local network of quality youth service programs to build upon in many communities. It also has a philosophical and programmatic affinity to S. 2373 that the Labor Department hasn't had since the Office of Youth Programs in the Employment and Training Administration was abolished 10 years ago.

What the Commission has that ETA lacks is the interest, vitality, and ability to take the youth subtitles of S. 2373 and run with them. A consolidated grant application and grant-making process is in place that could readily be modified and expedited to handle the Youth Corps programs envisions under S. 2373.

The current bill strives to achieve some crossover collaboration and consistency with the Commission on National Community Service and its funded programs. A compelling case can be made for integrated S. 2373 and its programs into the Commission.

The Commission will soon make its first round of grant awards to States. Almost all States will receive at least some modest initial funding for programs that involve students in community service. Subtitle C of S. 2373 complements very nicely the programs that will be funded under Serve America, subtitle B, part 1 of the National Community Service Act.

For those students interested in making a sustained and substantial commitment to service, the prospect of being able to bank educational incentive funds is highly attractive. The integration with the National and Community Service Act would go a long way towards assuring that the service provided by young people would be done in an organized program context. Furthermore, there is increasing acknowledgment in the youth service field of the reinforcing power of young people working in teams. We would strongly urge that team projects be given priority consideration for funding.

One area that would require some reconciliation of language and intent would be that of participant eligibility. The Serve America programs are designed to engage a broad spectrum of American youth. The requirements of S. 2373 are more targeted and restrictive. The targeting dilemma is a difficult one. Philosophically we prefer approaches that bring young people of different backgrounds together for a common experience. The Youth Volunteer Corps of America project which Youth Service America initiated with Kellogg Foundation support and recently spun off as a new independent non-profit with 11 operating sites, one of which is the Quad Cities area in Peoria, by the way, is a good example of a national

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expansion project that would fit nicely with the basic approach of subtitle C of 2373. It brings central city, outer city, and suburban teenagers together on team projects during the school year. That basic model could, in fact, be an ideal programmatic framework for subtitle C.

Other expansion models are well under way. Perhaps giving priority consideration to the recruitment and selection of the targeted population groups identified in Section 625 of S. 2373 would be an acceptable solution.

Let me turn briefly to subtitle D. The National Youth Corps Program is an intriguing approach. A terrific contribution to the youth service field would be the creation of 10 regional youth corps academies or training centers to which all the State corps and local youth corps would send staff and corps members for training. Only a few States now have the luxury or capability of providing structured training in a stable, centralized, year-round setting. The California Conservation Corps Training Academy, the oldest, largest, and most experienced of these, is about to be closed because of severe State budget cuts. It could, however, be expanded to provide training not only for State corps members, but to the increasing network of independent local urban corps and to programs in other States as well.

Imagine the powerful impact that could be made if part of the focus of a network of regional centers was to give experienced young youth corps participants an opportunity to leave their State and spend a second year in an intense supervisor training and on-the-job service experience with like-minded peers from other States, all of whom were committed to return to their home States to be junior staff in their sponsoring programs or to become service coordinators working with younger students who were putting in up to 250 hours of service a year while still in school.

This suggests a fairly radical reworking of subtitle D but, nevertheless, one that warrants serious consideration. A network of regional youth corps training centers would be an enormous asset to the youth corps community. It might also be very timely and appropriate to explore possible military training centers that are under consideration for closure. The work already begun by the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown and the National Guard to develop youth corps pilot centers in Oklahoma and West Virginia might be re-examined as the first phase of such a broader strategy.

I know my time is up, Mr. Chairman, and I have some other comments that I will submit for the record on the youth portion of the title. And I would also like, before the record is closed, to submit detailed comments on the bill on a realistic line-by-line basis.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Slobig follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. SLOBIG

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, my name is Frank Slobig. I am director of Policy and Programs for Youth Service America. YSA is a national, independent non-profit organization based in Washington, DC whose purpose is to promote the development of a national network of quality youth service programs in

order that every young American from 5 to 25 has the opportunity to participate in contributing to the betterment of their community and our country. We put a premium in participation by young people of all backgrounds serving together in teams in organized, sustained programs versus short-term single volunteer experiences.

The features of S. 2373 which most interest us are subtitles C and D, the Youth Community Corps Program and the National Youth Community Corps Program. Members of the YSA staff have worked with the staff of Senators Boren, Simon and Wofford in the drafting of the bill to date and are available to provide continued assistance in the future. We hope that you will accept our observations and recommendations as constructive commentary. The leadership of the youth service field is delighted at the initiative of Senator Boren and the initial list of cosponsors who have joined in support of S. 2373.

Youth Service America and its colleagues worked long and hard for the passage of the National and Community Service Act. This important and modestly funded new federal initiative enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Senate. All of the cosponsors of S. 2373 voted for the National and Community Service Act with the exception of Senator Wofford who was then still busy in Pennsylvania creating the most diverse array of youth corps initiatives of any state in the country. Had he been a U.S. Senator in the spring of 1990, he would have been leading the charge. Since his stunning election, he has become a singular and steadfast supporter in the Senate of youth service legislation. His experience and track record as Secretary of Labor and Industry in Pennsylvania is an enormous asset to the Senate and to this committee. What was accomplished with the job training system in Pennsylvania in the last 4 years, promoting the development of a decentralized network of youth service corps, is unparalleled. Pennsylvania has made the youth corps and job training connection significant and substantial, and should be imitated by every other state in the country.

As someone who spent 10 years in the federal Labor Department from 1971 to 1981 overseeing work and welfare programs and youth employment and training programs, I have some serious concerns about S. 2373 being tied to the Labor Department and the JTPA system. I would strongly urge that subtitles C and D be recast as amendments to the National and Community Service Act and that the new programs authorized be administered by the Commission on National and Community Service. Programmatically what S. 2373 proposes to establish is far more consistent with and complementary to the programs authorized under subtitle B, part I and subtitle C of the National and Community Service Act than they are with JTPA. It is true that the Commission on National and Community Service is a new independent federal agency whose first round of grants is only now about to be made. It doesn't have the established federal network and structure that the JTPA system has, but that may be an asset rather than a liability. What it does have is a growing local network of quality youth service programs to build upon in many communities. It also has a philosophical and programmatic affinity to S. 2373 that the Labor Department hasn't had since the Office of Youth Programs in the Employment and Training Administration was abolished 10 years ago. What the Commission has that ETA lacks is the interest, vitality and ability to take the youth subtitles of S. 2373 and run with them. A consolidated grant application and grant making process is in place that could readily be modified and expedited to handle the Youth Corps programs envisioned under S. 2373. The current bill strives to achieve some crossover collaboration and consistency with the Commission on National and Community Service and its funded programs. A compelling case can be made for integrating S. 2373 programs into the Commission.

The Commission will soon make its first round of grant awards to states. Almost all states will receive at least some modest initial funding for programs that involve students in community service. Subtitle C of S. 2373 complements very nicely the programs that will be funded under Serve America, Subtitle B, Part I of the National and Community Service Act. For those students interested in making a sustained and substantial commitment to service, the prospect of being able to bank educational incentive funds is highly attractive. The integration with the National and Community Service Act would go a long way towards assuring that the service provided by young people would be done in an organized program context. Furthermore, there is increasing acknowledgment in the youth service field of the reinforcing power of young people working in teams. We would strongly urge that team projects be given priority consideration for funding.

One area that would require some reconciliation of language and intent would be that of participant eligibility. The Serve America programs are designed to engage a broad spectrum of American youth. The requirements of S. 2373 are more targeted and restrictive. The targeting dilemma is a difficult one. Philosophically we prefer

40 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

approaches that bring young people of different backgrounds together for a common experience. The Youth Volunteer Corps of America is a project which Youth Service America initiated with Kellogg Foundation support and recently spun off as a new independent non-profit. It has 11 operating sites, one of which is in the Quad Cities area of Illinois and Iowa. This is a good example of a national expansion project that would fit nicely with the basic approach of Subtitle C of S. 2373. It brings central city, outer city and suburban teenagers together on team projects in the summer and in periodic weekend and after school projects during the school year. That basic model could, in fact, be an ideal programmatic framework for Subtitle C. Other expansion models are well underway. Perhaps, giving priority consideration to the recruitment and selection of the targeted population groups identified in Section 625 would be an acceptable solution to the targeting question.

Let me turn briefly to Subtitle D. The regional Youth Corps Program is an intriguing approach. A terrific contribution to the youth service field would be the creation of 10 regional youth corps academies or training centers to which all the state corps and local youth corps would send staff and corpsmembers for training. Only a few states now have the luxury or capability to provide structured training in a stable, centralized year round setting. The California Conservation Corps Training Academy, the oldest, largest and most experienced of these, is about to be closed because of severe state budget cuts. It could, however, be expanded to provide training not only for state corpsmembers but to the increasing network of independent local urban corps and to programs in other states as well. Imagine the powerful impact that could be made if part of the focus of a network of regional centers was to give experienced young youth corps participants an opportunity to leave their state and spend a second year in an intense supervisory training and on-the-job service experience with like-minded peers from other states, all of whom were committed to return to their home states to be junior staff in their sponsoring programs or to become service coordinators working with younger students who were putting in up to 250 hours of service a year while still in school!

This suggests a fairly radical reworking of Subtitle D, but nevertheless, one that warrants serious consideration. A network of regional youth corps training centers would be an enormous asset to the youth corps community. It might also be very timely and appropriate to explore possible military training centers that are under consideration for closure. The work begun by the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown and the National Guard to develop youth corps pilot centers in Oklahoma and West Virginia might be reexamined as the first phase of such a broader strategy.

Finally, let me be so bold as to suggest that maybe even the Community Works Progress, adult oriented job creation part of S. 2373 could be recast and integrated with the state administered Full and Part Time National Service Programs of the National and Community Service Act. The Commission rather than the Department of Labor might even administer them. As one who lived throughout the phasedown of the old Public Employment Program of the Emergency Employment Act of the early 70's and the big build up and later crash of the Public Service Employment programs of titles II and VI of the frequently but falsely reviled Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) Program, I fear yet another public job creation add-on to JTPA will meet with the scorn and skepticism that the CETA specter unfortunately evokes.

A dramatic increase in the National Service programs in their infancy may be both politically more palatable and programmatically more defensible. It would make it possible for national networks like Youth Build that have strong community roots, private foundation interest and a compelling dual social purpose-namely, reclaiming high risk youth and rebuilding much needed affordable low income housing, to flourish. Job training oriented service programs like the Urban Corps Expansion Project which is evolving in 11 cities could reach a scale of impact and visibility where we might see a real difference. National service is not just for the young. New and creative urban corps of adults and rural networks of community development teams could bring hope and constructive, self enhancing opportunities to thousands and not just hundreds. New ventures like the tri-state Delta Corps about to be launched in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi could expand their focus and potential impact to a substantial number of rural counties and parishes in those states.

The opportunity presents itself to make a dramatic and creative leap forward in the effort to rebuild a sense of community and an ethic of service in this country. Your bill may become just the vehicle for doing it. Thank you for this opportunity to share my concerns and ideas. YSA plans to provide more detailed comments on specific sections of S. 2373 while the hearing record is still open.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thank you for contacting Youth Service America. It is always good to hear about outstanding youth service in their communities. It is also wonderful to see such an increase in the awards your office was able to give this year. Being a part of National Youth Service Day really shows an effort from you concerning youth service in America.

I am glad the youth are interested in other volunteer efforts they can get involved in around the country. Personally I don't have information on the National Caring Award. The National Collaboration for Youth should have the information on this particular award as well as others your group may be interested in. Another organization that gives national awards is the Points of Light Foundation. The addresses and phones numbers for the organizations mentioned are below:

Points of Light Foundation,
736 Jackson Place,
Washington, DC 20503,
(202) 408-5162.

National Collaboration for Youth,
1319 F St. NW, Suite 600,
Washington, DC 20004,
(202) 347-2080.

Another way to involve your organization in national youth service programs along with National Youth Service Day, is by becoming a Youth Service of America Professional Affiliate. Many organizations, such as your own, enjoy the services to programs and organizations interested in being directly linked to an inner circle of field leaders. These are outlined in the enclosed brochure. This program was designed to help keep local practitioners, and others interested in the youth service field, up-to-date with local, regional and national developments in the field.

I look forward to hearing from you again. Good luck in your youth service programs. Please don't hesitate if I can be of any further assistance.

Senator SIMON. We would welcome that.

There is a vote on now on the floor, unfortunately, so we will take an 8- to 10-minute recess while I run over. I will be back very shortly. Sorry.

[Recess.]

Senator SIMON. The subcommittee hearing will resume. My apologies again.

Mickey Kaus, we are pleased to hear from you.

Mr. KAUS. Senator, I suppose the reason I am here is because I have written a book on the subject, but you wrote your book first, "Putting America Back To Work," and if my book makes any contribution, it is because I was able to follow through on the thinking that you did in that book.

Senator SIMON. You are kind, but I also remember in preparing for my book, I read probably the longest article I had ever seen in The New Republic about a jobs program written by Mickey Kaus.

Mr. KAUS. It is interesting, because when I started writing this book in 1985, I had what I think is the common-sense attitude of many Americans, which is. It doesn't make sense to pay people to do nothing. If there are people who need work and the dignity of work and there is work to be done, why shouldn't the Government have a WPA-like program to pay them to do that work?

When I started researching the book, all the welfare experts who I talked with said, oh, no, it is much more complicated than that, you don't understand the special problems of single mothers and the special problems of the inner cities. And now when I talk to people and politicians as a reporter, I find politicians of both parties—and I include some very conservative Republicans in this category—drifting back toward the common-sense WPA solution. So I think this is a moment that is ripe for the taking to build that sort

of left/right coalition to make the choice that Franklin Roosevelt thought he was making in 1935, when he delivered the famous speech that everybody cites about how the dole is a narcotic and the Federal Government must quit this business of relief and substitute what he thought was going to be a guaranteed job in the WPA.

Roosevelt, I should be quick to add, had a much easier decision to make in many ways than the one Congress faces today. As has been mentioned by others, the unemployed workforce was very different then, but, nevertheless, I think there are some ways in which we should follow what he did. One thing is it was a package deal. The way he saw the WPA, it was a replacement for the dole. He ended the Federal dole, or tried to end the Federal dole and replace it with work. It wasn't that the WPA created a whole bunch of jobs that then were on top of cash relief payments.

That was very easy for him to do because he was dealing with a population of able-bodied, mainly men. Now we have the many people on AFDC, which is our main welfare program, are single mothers with young children, and it is much harder to tell them you have to go into the workforce. You have to provide them with day care, and you have to worry about their children. What if they refuse to go into the workforce? You don't want to punish their children.

Congress has tried through the Family Support Act to sort of push people out into the workforce, without cutting off their checks, and we are discovering it is very slow going. Even the encouraging results from California showed that there was only a four percent reduction even in what are regarded as quite successful Family Support Act programs, only a four percent reduction in the welfare rolls. So I think it is very important that we do something more to replace welfare with work.

I want to go briefly into why I think it is so important to use WPA-style jobs to replace welfare, and that is because, as a researcher named John Kasarda at North Carolina points out, welfare probably didn't cause the under-class to form; it didn't cause the problems of our ghettos; it didn't cause the problems we see in Los Angeles. But it probably did enable those problems to arise by providing an economic substitute for work. If welfare hadn't been there when these problems were forming in the 1960's and 1970's, probably the people in those communities would have had to go to where the jobs were moving. The jobs were leaving the inner city and moving to the suburbs. A lot of people left the inner city to follow those jobs, but not all of them, and the people that stayed behind were the people who then moved on to the welfare rolls.

So the biggest handle the Government has on ghetto poverty, on the culture of poverty, is that welfare payments to sustain it. And if we can replace welfare with a job, I think you will find that the whole culture of the inner city changes. I don't think any mother has a baby to go on welfare, but women who have children out of wedlock know somehow in the back of their minds that welfare will be there to sustain them. They see other people in their communities who make similar decisions and who survive. And it is my strong belief that if you change that background condition so people know that if they have a baby they are still going to have to

work and maybe they should form a two-parent family, maybe they should put off having the child until they can support it, the whole basis for the culture will change.

That is why I urge that I think it is so important that there are these provisions in the bill that require the WPA work of welfare mothers, that it not just be a CETA program on top of welfare. So I think the 9-month limit on job training is very important.

The other point that I want to make is that the bill is extremely well timed because we do have all these very talented supervisors from the military. And I think it is great that the Senate is taking advantage of this opportunity. The one anecdote I have to tell, I recommend a book by Barbara Blumberg called "The New Deal and the Unemployed," which tells the story of the WPA in New York and how it was run by a country boy from Arkansas who New Yorkers looked askance at when he arrived to town. But he ran the program so well, being an ex-military man, that by the time he left town, they were practically giving him 21-gun salutes.

I think any WPA, even a well-run WPA, will have the occasional boondoggle. But it will also have one virtue that none of the other solutions I have heard in the wake of the Los Angeles riots would have, which is it would eventually work. Maybe not in one generation; it will be slow going. But eventually I think if you change welfare and replace it with work, you will change that entire culture for the better.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kaus follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. KAUS

My name is Mickey Kaus. I am a senior editor at *The New Republic* magazine and have just completed a book on American social welfare policy, *The End of Equality*, which will be published this summer by New Republic/Basic Books. I began writing that book in 1985, and my only qualification to appear before you today is that I've spent much of the time since then investigating, and thinking about, the dilemmas of our welfare system. In particular, I've tried like so many others to figure out how the government could solve the greatest social problem our nation faces, the problem of what sociologist William Julius Wilson calls the "ghetto poor" or underclass—a problem that, as the riots in my hometown of Los Angeles showed, is far from a solution today.

That is why I'm happy to testify today in favor of the Community Works Progress Act, which I believe represents the one approach to the problem of entrenched poverty that will work. I am also convinced it is the approach that will find the most support among the American people. Like many Americans, I have never quite understood the virtue of government programs that send cash benefits to support able-bodied people who might be working and contributing to the economy. At the same time—again like many Americans—I accept the truth that the private economy has not, at all times and in all places, provided enough work for all those who seek it. Why can't the government provide productive, last-resort jobs for those who need them, instead of cash welfare that in effect pays people for doing nothing?

I wasn't around during the WPA era. But I did grow up playing basketball in a gym built by the WPA. I do remember watching a Republican who lived through the WPA era, Ronald Reagan, heap praise on the program on national television shortly before he was elected President. Yet when I began reporting on this subject, various experts assured me that it was much more complex than it seemed, that replacing welfare with work was simply impractical, and practically unthinkable. When I report on welfare today, in contrast, I find people of both parties concluding that the simple, common sense impulse to provide work, not cash, is in fact the right one. That doesn't mean it isn't fraught with potential difficulties, and I want to mention at least some of those difficulties today. But the basic choice of replacing welfare with work is right.

President Roosevelt probably thought he'd made that choice for good almost sixty years ago when he told Congress:

> [C]ontinued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. . . . I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash, of market baskets, of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destitution but also their self-respect, their self-reliance and courage and determination.

To take the place of "direct" relief, Roosevelt proposed the Works Progress Administration, to employ over 3 million jobless. Unlike makework, WPA work would be "useful in the sense that it affords permanent improvements in living conditions or that it creates future new wealth for the nation." FDR mentioned slum clearance, housing construction, rural electrification, highway construction. Those who weren't expected to work (the aged, the blind) would still get cash relief. But aside from temporary unemployment compensation, there would be no cash aid for Americans who could be in the labor force. "Work must be found for the able-bodied but destitute," Roosevelt declared. "The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief."

It's ironic that Democrats who invoke FDR's "compassionate" legacy often ignore his anti-dole decision of 1935, or else pass it off as a quaint, bit of residual conservatism. Meanwhile, Presidents Reagan and Bush both invoked Roosevelt's description of the dole as "a narcotic," but failed to mention that Roosevelt said this in the speech where he proposed the largest government jobs program in the nation's history. In fact, FDR's anti-dole and pro-WPA opinions were of a piece, a decision in favor of work-welfare and against cash-welfare. Three years later, Roosevelt's aide Harry Hopkins would reaffirm FDR's decision in public testimony:

> On the question of a work program as against direct relief, it is my conviction, and one of the strongest convictions I hold, that the Federal government should never return to a direct relief program. It is degrading to the individual; it destroys morale and self-respect; it results in no increase in the wealth of the community; it tends to destroy the ability of the individual to perform useful work in the future and it tends to establish a permanent body of dependents. We should do away with direct relief for the unemployed in the United States.

In many ways, of course, Roosevelt's decision was easier to make than the decision Congress faces today. Roosevelt made his decision during a Depression, when even prime, experienced, skilled workers were unable to find a job. A WPA today would have to be prepared to employ workers who are at the bottom of the employment market, including the unskilled, those who have dropped out of high school, those who are recovering from addiction. Roosevelt applied his decision only to able-bodied adults who weren't solely responsible for taking care of children. The crucial dilemma we face today is a more difficult one, namely how to replace the cash welfare that goes largely to single mothers.

Nevertheless, it's instructive to use Roosevelt's 1935 decision as a guide to today's problem. Because I think his actions reflect at least four principles that, if applied through a new WPA, would eventually help us solve the problem of ghetto poverty and assimilate the underclass into the mainstream of society. These four ideas are:

1. *The WPA should replace welfare, not supplement it:* Again, FDR had it comparatively easy. Because his decision did not apply to single mothers, he did not have to worry about what would happen to their children if he ended relief checks. He could simply end the checks, and offer as an alternative WPA jobs.

Faced with the problem of single mothers on welfare, Congress has now embarked on the more difficult task of moving these recipients into the labor market without cutting off the checks that support their children. It is becoming clear that this is very difficult to do. The Family Support Act of 1988 seems to be making only a marginal difference. The recent encouraging report on California's GAIN program, for example, showed that after a year on the program 73.4 percent of the single parents were still on welfare. That compares with 76.4 percent of a control group that did not participate in GAIN. So even this successful Family Support Act style program produced only a 4 percent reduction in the welfare rolls.

Why is replacing welfare so important for today's problem of "ghetto poverty?" Start with what is the consensus explanation for how the largely African-American underclass was formed in the first place. As described by William Julius Wilson, the story goes something like this: When Southern blacks migrated North, they settled, thanks to segregation, in urban ghettos. Then, beginning in the 1960s, two things

happened. First, well-paying, unskilled jobs started to leave the central cities for the suburbs. Second, upper- and middle-class blacks, aided by civil rights and fair housing laws, began to leave as well. This out-migration left the poorest elements of black society behind—now isolated, concentrated, and freed from the restraints the black middle class had quite self-consciously imposed. Without jobs and role models, those left behind in the ghettos drifted out of the legal labor market.

But that leaves a crucial question hanging—a question asked by John Kasarda of the University of North Carolina: How were "economically displaced inner city residents able to survive?" Kasarda's answer: "welfare programs." He notes that by 1982, in the central cities, there were more black single mothers who weren't working than who were. The vast majority of those not working weren't even looking for work. And 80 percent of these single mothers were getting some form of welfare, mainly the cash assistance provided by Aid to Families with Dependent Children. AFDC not only provided what Kasarda calls an "economic substitute for traditional blue-collar jobs," but it provided it in a form available, by and large, to mothers in broken homes.

The point is that welfare may not have been the main cause of the underclass, but it enabled the underclass to form. And if welfare is what enables the underclass to form, that opens up the possibility that replacing welfare will "de-enable" the underclass. That, I think, is the great hope of the legislation you are considering today. Certainly, if we're looking for a handle on the culture of poverty, there is none bigger than the cash welfare programs that constitute some 65 percent of the legal income of single mothers in the bottom fifth of the income distribution.

If cash welfare were replaced with work, and day care, and an Earned Income Tax Credit that took low-wage workers out of poverty, the entire economic basis for the culture of the "underclass" would be transformed. Young women contemplating single-motherhood would think twice about putting themselves in a position where they would have to juggle taking care of their child with working (at a not-very-lucrative job if necessary). Life as it is too often lived in the ghetto—life in broken homes with no worker present—would simply become impossible. At the same time, a decent life in the mainstream, working culture would be made available to everyone. The natural incentives to form two-parent, working families would reassert themselves. Why struggle as a single parent on one income when you can join with another worker and live on two incomes, or live on one and stay home with your child? But even children of single mothers would grow up in homes structured by the rhythms and discipline of work.

That is why it is so encouraging that S. 2373 is framed as a plan to replace welfare with work. In particular, requiring that all able-bodied welfare recipients who aren't in training or education programs take WPA jobs would be a major step in the right direction. It will be an even bigger step if limits are placed on the extent to which training and education can become excuses for not coming to terms with the need to work. A provision limiting training to 9 months seems very important, and I urge you to consider similar, if more generous, limits on the time that participating in the education component of the Family Support Act will excuse a recipient from S. 2373's work requirement.

2. *Neo-WPA work should pay slightly less than private sector work.* When Roosevelt proposed the WPA in 1935, he said the wage should be "larger than the amount now received as a relief dole, but at the same time not so large as to encourage the rejection of opportunities for private employment or the leaving of private employment to engage in government work."

That principle remains sound today. The problem, of course, is that today the amount "received as a relief dole" is, in some states, greater than the minimum private sector wage. The solution to this problem—and it's not an inexpensive solution, as you know—is to set the WPA wage below whatever the legal minimum wage is, and then to supplement the incomes of all low wage workers, in the WPA and in the private sector. The obvious vehicle for this, as noted, is the Earned Income Tax Credit. I worry that avoiding this EITC solution will lead to some perversities. For example, the current draft of S. 2373, as I understand it, offers welfare recipients who go to work 10 percent above their AFDC benefits. In a high-benefit state like California, that means the WPA would be paying the equivalent of $5.50 an hour for 32 hours of work a week well above the minimum wage. That might make it less likely that WPA workers will move into the private sector.

3. *The interests of providing decent work for everyone may conflict with the interests of organized labor.* It's an unfortunate fact that if WPA workers perform useful tasks they may also be performing tasks that better-paid, unionized might perform, if local budgets permitted it. Fairness demands that no existing government workers be displaced by a WPA, and I understand there are provisions in S. 2373 that offer

such protection. But beyond that, insistence that a WPA pay "prevailing wages" not only violates principle #2 (offering welfare recipients far more than they might earn in the private sector), it threatens to make WPA employment impractical, hurting those at the bottom of the economic ladder who need last-resort jobs.

In the '30s, the American Federation of Labor almost crippled the original WPA by demanding that it pay prevailing wages. FDR actually broke a strike over the issue in 1939, an incident described in Barbara Blumberg's excellent history, The New Deal and The Unemployed. I worry that the prevailing wage provision in the current draft of the bill will effectively preclude the new Community WPA from undertaking many useful construction projects. But perhaps there is a possible compromise here that will satisfy all sides.

4. *Parts of the WPA would be not unlike the military, and those with military experience can he expected to perform well in supervisory roles.* A good example is the experience of New York City with the WPA. As you probably know, the WPA left New York with a valuable legacy of public works, including LaGuardia airport and FDR Drive. But the New York WPA wasn't very efficient until it was taken over by an Arkansas "country boy" from the Army Corps of Engineers, Col. Brehon Somervell. Cosmopolitian New Yorkers were initially hostile to Somervell, but he ran the program so well that when he resigned in 1940 to go to war even the anti-WPA New York World Telegram praised him for building a "quietly efficient business organization able to spend a billion dollars with nary a scandal or criticism of greater than trifling proportions."

The reasons why military people might do well in a WPA are obvious: both are large, potentially cumbersome organizations. Both attempt to mold and discipline raw human potential and bend it to productive ends. One of the most promising aspects of the proposed legislation is the way it might make use of all the former military personnel who are being released in the post-Cold War reduction of our armed forces. We know that the armed forces themselves have been a great avenue of upward mobility for those at the bottom of the job market. With the help of former military personnel, a WPA could perform a similar function. It's wonderful that the Senate is thinking of taking advantage of this historic accident—that we need the military's supervisory talents just when those talents are being freed from military needs.

Of course, even with top-flight supervision, any new WPA would have its share of inefficiency and scandal. Even when Somervell's New York WPA was going full bore, completing a building every three days, he estimated it was only 60 percent as efficient as the equivalent private enterprise. Boondoggles will happen. But the taxpayers would at least be getting something for their money. But the taxpayers would at least be getting something for their money

And, for all these potential pitfalls, replacing cash welfare with a revived WPA has a distinct virtue not shared by any of the other remedies offered up in the wake of the L.A. riot: we can say with some confidence that it will work. It will cure the problem of "ghetto poverty." Not within one generation, necessarily, or even two. But eventually. Welfare is how the underclass (unhappily, unintentionally) survives. Change welfare—replace it with work—and the underclass will change as well.

Thank you very much.

Senator SIMON. I thank you.

Kathleen Selz.

Ms. SELZ. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to speak this afternoon on behalf of the national network of youth service and conservation corps, one of which is the Philadelphia Youth Service Corps, from whom you have already heard.

Let me begin by saying how pleased we are about your interest in expanding opportunities for young people and for communities through the Works Progress Act of 1992. We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Act.

I would also like to take just a moment, though, to thank you, and Senator Kennedy as well, for the support that you provided to the National and Community Service Act back in 1990. And I would also like to thank you, since I have got you captive, for the long-time support you have provided to VISTA. More than 20 years ago, I was a VISTA volunteer working with Native Americans in

the State of Montana. At that time, the Federal Government invested $6,000 in me to enable me to be a full-time year-round volunteer. That experience changed my life, just as participation in the Civilian Conservation Corps changed lives, just as volunteer experiences continue to change lives for young people today. So I thank you for that.

Senator SIMON. We thank you, and you are a good advertisement for VISTA and what it does, not just in the immediate job benefits——

Ms. SELZ. You will find many people in the youth service community who got their own start as either Peace Corps or VISTA volunteers or working in some capacity. Not all of the War on Poverty programs were a bust.

In recent weeks, as the Nation has dealt with the aftermath of Los Angeles and the riots in other cities, there have been many calls for the re-establishment of both the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. In addition to you and Senator Boren and the other cosponsors of this bill, Arthur Ashe and David Broder, writers in this week's issues of U.S. News & World Report and Newsweek have spoken out in favor of going back to some of the old effective solutions.

I am pleased to tell you that we do not have to re-create the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC is alive, and there are some implications that relate to subtitles C and D of the Act that I would like to share with you.

As we sit here today, there are 10,000 young people wearing corps uniforms and working on projects in both wilderness areas and in the middle of our inner cities, including Los Angeles. This summer, another 10,000 young people will join their ranks when the summer youth corps programs begin. The CCC was effective in the 1930's, and the contemporary version of the Civilian Conservation Corps is working just as well today in 20 States and 45 cities and counties around the country.

Both Senators Kennedy and Wofford gave wonderful descriptions of youth corps, along with Tony Fairbanks from Philadelphia, so I won't go into great detail about what each one looks like. I will just provide a quick overview:

There are 65. The oldest and largest is California. There are 12 new ones operating under a national demonstration called the Urban Corps Expansion Program, and there is a new one right here in D.C. called the D.C. Service Corps. It will celebrate its first anniversary this summer.

Collectively, the corps right now provide approximately 20,000 young people aged 16 to 23, both urban and rural, both men and women, with a combined educational and public service experience through year-round and summer programs.

Today's corps truly are the contemporary version of the CCC. The corps give young adults, most of whom did not fare well in the traditional educational system, a second chance at developing the academic, employment, and life skills they need to move into the workforce and become productive citizens.

I must add that sometimes I think that the corps don't really give many youngsters a second chance. They are often the first chance that young corps members have. The first family, the first

safe place that they have ever been in their lives, where there is discipline, predictability, accountability, and a sense of expectation and hope. It is no wonder that many corps members want to stay on after completing their first year. We wish they could.

As has been noted, each corps member performs hundreds of hours of valuable community service work. A number of the speakers today have already itemized the kinds of projects that they are involved in, but when I listened to the first panel, the Senators, talking about the cultural contributions that the WPA made, I am reminded of one corps in Milwaukee which has youngsters volunteering, doing their public service work at the Milwaukee Repertory Theater. So while many corps members are out landscaping, renovating housing, or doing natural resource management work, the range of activities is very broad. Some of our young people in Milwaukee are designing costumes, building sets, and developing an appreciation for the arts.

This extra dimension of public service makes the corps more than just employment and training. It turns young people into resources and not problems.

My message to you today regarding the Community Works Progress Act is a simple one: We deeply appreciate and fully support the intent of the legislation and the principles of work and service that are behind it. However, just as the contemporary CCC is working, we think that the contemporary WPA will work, too. We worry, though, about setting up new administrative structures to administer the youth service programs under subtitles C and D of the Act.

I was reminded by today's Washington Post about the difficulties that the administration is now encountering in launching its "weed and seed" initiative. New structures take a while to set up. As you and your colleagues consider how best to expand job and public service opportunities for young people, we strongly urge that you factor the vehicles that already exist, including the State and local corps, into your plans.

The existing youth service and conservation corps are in place. They are addressing the same kinds of young people and doing essentially what the subtitle D, National Youth Community Corps Program proposes to do, although not necessarily in residential centers. The existing youth corps have a mix of State and local public support, private foundation support, a broad base of funding. Many are already linked into the existing JTPA network. The youth corps are well established in their communities. They could start tomorrow to easily double the number of young people and then go on from there.

In his eloquent address to the Senate back on May 12th, and then again today, Senator Wofford pointed out the vast potential of the Commission on National and Community Service. We echo his remarks and recommend that you consider the Commission as a partner in your efforts. It already has a mandate that truly complements your goal of bringing together the needs of employment and training for young people and the needs of the communities in which they live. It also has an administrative structure that could put out additional Federal funds in a rapid and orderly fashion.

As we look to past solutions such as the WPA and the CCC to model new solutions, we ask that some of the existing solutions, including the youth service and conservation corps, are not overlooked.

Again, thank you for your leadership. We look forward to working with you and your staff and the rest of the subcommittee members in great detail on this initiative.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Selz follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MS. SELZ

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Kathleen Selz, Executive Director of the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps (NASCC). It is privilege to speak this afternoon on behalf of the national network of youth conservation and service corps programs. Let me begin by saying how pleased we are, Mr. Chairman, about your interest in expanding opportunities for young people and communities through the "Community Works Progress Act of 1992." We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Act.

In recent weeks, as the nation has dealt with the aftermath of the riots in Los Angeles and other cities, there have been many calls for the re-establishment of both the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. In addition to you and Senator Boren and the other cosponsors of this Act, Arthur Asche and David Border, writers in this week's issues of US News and World Report and Newsweek have spoken out in favor of some old, effective solutions.

I am pleased to tell you that we do not have to recreate the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC is alive in the form of 65 state and local service and conservation corps across the country. As we sit here today, there are 10,000 young people, wearing corps uniforms and working in on projects in both wilderness areas and in the middle of our inner cities, including Los Angeles. This summer another 10,000 young people will join their ranks, when the summer youth corps programs begin. The CCC was effective in the 1930's and the contemporary version of the CCC is working just as effectively now in 20 states and 45 cities and counties across the country.

For the record, I have brought along materials that will introduce you to the existing 65 state and local youth corps. These include some of the oldest and largest, such as the California Conservation Corps, and some of the newest, including 12 local urban corps that have been launched within the past two years under the Urban Corps Expansion Project (UCEP)—a national demonstration jointly sponsored by Public/Private Ventures and NASCC. And, of course, we have a new corps right here in Washington—the D.C. Service Corps that will celebrate its first anniversary this summer

Collectively the corps annually provide approximately 20,000 young people, aged 16–23, both urban and rural, with a combined educational and public service experience through year round and, summer programs. Some of the statewide conservation corps operate residential centers. Most corps, however, are nonresidential with young people living and working in their own communities.

Today's youth corps truly are the contemporary version of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's with some elements of the WPA as well. Corps give young adults—most of whom did not fare well in the traditional educational system—a second chance at developing the academic, employment and life skills they need to enter the work force and become productive citizens. Perhaps more important, the corps provide young people with the sense of family and community that alleviates the alienation we witnessed so tragically in Los Angeles. For many of our corpsmembers, the corps truly is the first family they have experienced, the first safe, predictable place they have ever been. It is no wonder that many corpsmembers want to stay on after completing their first year. We wish they could.

Each corpsmember performs hundreds of hours of valuable community service work. Some provide conservation and resource management services in national and state parks and forests; others work to conserve urban parks and recreation areas to renovate housing and other community facilities, and to help an array of public and private human services agencies meet the needs of vulnerable citizens of all ages.

This extra dimension of public service makes the corps much more than just another employment and training program. It turns young people into resources rather than problems. Quite simply, youth corps are in the business of changing lives and in the process they change communities too.

Funding for the corps—a total of roughly $100 million annually—comes from diverse sources—state and local government agencies, foundation and corporate grants, JTPA, Community Development Block Grants and considerable fee-for-service revenue. However, the field has essentially grown up and survived without targeted federal support. An earlier federal funding mechanism for state Youth Conservation Corps and Young Adult Conservation Corps was eliminated in 1981.

That is one reason why we are delighted to have a federal partner—the new Commission on National and City Service—at last. We expect to see the first infusion of federal funds in more than a decade, when the Commission awards its first grants under Subtitle C of the National and Community Service Act to existing and new corps early this summer. We treasure this small but vital $22.5 million coming our way, for the vast potential of youth corps is truly hampered only by the chronic scarcity of funding.

Recommendations

My message to you today regarding the "Community Works Progress Act of 1992" is a simple one. We appreciate and fully support the intent of the legislation. Just as the contemporary CCC is working, we believe that a contemporary will work too. We worry, however, about the delay in setting up new administrative structures to administer the youth service programs under the Act. I am thinking in particular of the difficulties that the Administration has encountered in launching its "Weed and Seed" initiative, as reported in today's Washington Post.

As you and your colleagues consider how best to expand job and public service opportunities for young people and to strengthen communities, we strongly urge that you factor the vehicles that already exist—including the state and local youth corps—into your plans.

The existing youth service and conservation corps are in place, addressing the same kind of young people and doing essentially what the "Subtitle D—National Youth Community Corps Program" proposes, although not necessarily in residential centers. The existing youth corps already have a mix of state and local public funding, as well as private support. Moreover many are already linked into the JTPA network. The youth corps are well established in their communities. They could start tomorrow to easily double the number of young people served and go on from there.

In his eloquent address to the Senate on May 12, Senator Wofford pointed to the vast potential of the Commission on National and Community Service and its programs. We echo his remarks and recommend that you consider the Commission on National and Community Service as a partner in your efforts. It already has a mandate that truly complements your goal of bringing the needs of young people and communities together and an administrative structure in place that could put additional federal funds out in a fast and orderly fashion.

As we look to pant solutions such as the WPA and the CCC to model new solutions, we ask that the existing solutions not be overlooked.

Again, we appreciate your leadership in creating new job and public service opportunities for young people and this opportunity to share our thoughts with you. We look forward to working with you on this exciting initiative.

Senator SIMON. We thank you.

How are the young people in your project selected?

Ms. SELZ. There are a variety of recruitment procedures. Some are recruited through the schools. Others—in fact, most, probably—through word of mouth. Sometimes the various public employment agencies will refer young people to the corps. And sometimes the staff themselves go out and speak at gatherings of young people at other community centers.

Many of our programs are oversubscribed. There are waiting lists. And what we find is that at the end of the year we have to kick our corpsmembers out the door. So we could easily handle twice the number of young people as we are able to serve now.

Senator SIMON. Do you have, for example, a program here in Washington?

Ms. SELZ. Yes, the D.C. Service Corps.

Senator SIMON. If, in fact, we were to pick Washington as one of the three urban areas, it would not just be an expansion of two or three times, but many times.

Ms. SELZ. Exponentially, yes.

Senator SIMON. And you think you could move in that direction?

Ms. SELZ. Oh, certainly. Certainly. Some of the corps serve up to 500 youngsters and are limited only because of the level of funding. They could easily double. Even the smallest ones could take on significant numbers of young people.

Senator SIMON. Any practical suggestions that you may have—some of you have given those practical suggestions—we would welcome.

Ms. Sweeney mentioned a very practical problem, and I don't know the answer, but we are brainstorming here. That is, in order not to make the appropriation for this too high, what we are doing is tacking on—in other words, you get the check for, let's say, AFDC and then you would get an additional check here.

Now, ideally, I agree with Ms. Sweeney; it would be nice just to get that check for the job instead of getting that welfare check. We have discussed this. To get the full check, however, we would have to make an appropriation for the full amount, not the additional amount, not the increment there. And that creates problems in getting a bill passed over on the Senate floor.

Do you follow what I am saying?

Ms. SWEENEY. Yes. I am not sure that is true, though, because if you—I guess the problem would be that right now part of it is funded through the States. The AFDC recipient's benefit is a match between State and Federal money. And so if you were to pick up the entire piece of it and not have the States contribute their share, you would have a bigger appropriation.

Senator SIMON. That is one problem. You would have a bigger appropriation because of that, and the total, aside from that State part, would not be greater, but in terms of the immediate appropriation we will have to have to pass this bill, it becomes appreciably greater. That is a very practical problem, and it may be one we just can't get around. I agree with you in theory.

Ms. SWEENEY. Even if there is a way to use the funds from the AFDC program, to have those moneys somehow transferred to you for that paycheck? I mean, isn't there——

Senator SIMON. I don't know. There may be some way.

Mr. SLOBIG. It has been years since I have been involved in the work and welfare stuff, but there were a number of demonstrations that I had some responsibility for years ago where, through the Section 1115 waiver procedure in the Social Security act, you could convert benefits into wages and be able to accommodate what it sounds like the dilemma is.

Now, whether you can do that on the unemployment compensation side of the equation equally or not, I don't know.

Senator SIMON. Yes.

Ms. SWEENEY. And the President has indicated a strong interest in granting waiver requests this year.

Senator SIMON. You also mentioned one other thing, and the education part of this is David Boren's suggestion, which I think is an excellent one. I also think Harry Reid is correct. We are improv-

ing this thing as we move along. But it is also true that for people of limited income, to say later on when you go to school you are going to get $10,000 for each year you have worked here, that becomes not as immediate as that need that they have right now. It may be that if we could even give a small cash amount—what do you get under your program? What are people paid?

Ms. SELZ. The average stipend is $100 a week. Sometimes it is cast as minimum wage and an hourly rate, but by and large across the corps, it is about $100 a week.

Senator SIMON. I don't know. $100 a week would get you up pretty close—the amount that you get at minimum wage four days a week is $535 a month. We face another problem here, and I am tossing out the problems. And I don't know any way around this one. I wrote it down here. What did I do with it?

Anyway, in the State of Alabama, a three-person family gets $124 now. That family going to $535, that is a huge amount of help. On the other hand—and this gets into yours, Ms. Sweeney, when you say people doing the same job—in the alphabet right after Alabama is the State that pays the most, Alaska. A family of three gets $891. If you add a 10 percent increment, then you have a huge differential.

Now, in fact, the Federal Government is investing more in Alabama than in Alaska, but you do have a great disparity in what is being paid. Now, in fairness, the cost of living in Alaska is much greater than it is in Alabama. But do you see this as a great problem?

Mickey Kaus, you are frowning. I don't know what that means.

Mr. KAUS. Well, food stamps do make up much of the difference, so I think probably in Alabama that person gets about $300 a month, something like that, in food stamps. So it is not that much of an increment to go up to $535.

I think it is a problem mainly, as I see it, in high-benefit States where this—in California I calculated that if the 10 percent were added to just the AFDC portion of the food stamps, this job would be the equivalent of a $5.15 an hour job, which is considerably greater than is available in the minimum wage. So you create that disincentive that Roosevelt didn't want to create when he set up the WPA wage, tried to set it below the lowest private sector wage.

Fortunately, there are only 13 States, I am told, where that is true, where AFDC is above the minimum wage. Unfortunately, one of them is California, which is a gigantic State.

My impression is these problems are quite difficult, which is why in my book what I call for is some sort of system by which the welfare check would actually end and a paycheck would then follow in train, so you wouldn't have to worry about gearing the paycheck to the welfare check; you could either time limit welfare benefits or do something where the person would be out of the welfare system entirely and wouldn't be comparing this job she is getting in the WPA with what her welfare check used to be, because the welfare check wouldn't be there anymore.

I think eventually that is the system that we are going to have to gravitate to. The difficulties involving this first step seem probably surmountable, but there are genuine difficulties.

Senator SIMON. Mr. Slobig, you have had experience in this whole area, and you mentioned you were concerned about it being set up with a PIC program. One of the pluses, as we talked about this, is you bring a group of people aboard who see the benefits in terms of garnering some public support. There are some minuses to it.

But one of the other things we have in here in order to avoid the criticism that Senator Thurmond made about the cost is a 10 percent limitation on administration. Is that realistic or is it not?

Mr. SLOBIG. The National Community Service Act has a five percent limit on administration. JTPA, I believe—I can't remember, Brian. What is it, 15?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is 15, and we are moving it up.

Mr. SLOBIG. 15 in one part, 20 in another?

The way the National Community Service Act subtitle C programs which the youth corps parts of this or at least the full-time year-round youth corps part of this would be akin to are being administered by designed lead agencies that the Governors have chosen. There is a very interesting array of administrative relationships that are in itself going to be an interesting experiment to watch evolve in the States. The Governors could have chosen all human services agencies. They could have chosen job training agencies. They could have chosen whomever they chose to chose. And they ended up with about a dozen of them being held in the Governors' offices themselves in some kind of existing task force coordinating vehicle that crosses departmental lines so that they consciously had a vehicle for a much more deliberative, collaborative relationship at the State level.

In about a dozen, the Departments of Education are taking the lead. In about a dozen, some existing State office of volunteerism or voluntary action or whatever it is called has the lead. In four or five, the employment and training agency has the lead.

But all of them had the opportunity to apply for and compete for youth corps funding under the Act. The Commission is about to make—they have made their decisions. They haven't made public their grant awards because they are currently negotiating the bottom lines with each of the States. But they have made decisions to grant youth corps funding to 30 States.

Now, those 30 States are probably going to have, I would guess, at least eight to ten different administrative entities at the State level that will be responsible for at least the fiscal administration, if not the programmatic administration, of those funds.

It says to us that you can do it expeditiously and not necessarily be locked into any given administrative entity. The concern, quite frankly, that I have as an old employment and training professional about the current JTPA system is that it has gotten so far away from this type of programming, except in places like Pennsylvania and a couple of other States where they are doing some things that are akin to and not nearly at the level that Pennsylvania has done it, that the difficulty is that you are going to be forced with the dilemma of trying to get an enormous big bureaucracy to change its thinking and behavior and way of acting.

I am not saying you can't do it. You can. But going back and looking at some of the lessons from old Title II and VI of old CETA

days, and even before that, the old Emergency Employment Act, the old public employment program stuff, suggests to me that it may be a high-risk/high-gain option, but I would not discount the possibility of using the administrative structure that the Commission on National Community Service has set up to expeditiously move this stuff, at least the youth parts of it.

I even boldly in my statement, at the end of it, suggest that you may want to even consider it for the adult job creation dimensions of it. Now, that may sound totally wacky and off the wall, and yet what we are trying to accomplish, it seems to me, is both attitudinal and philosophical as well as programmatic. We are asking people to look at disengaged individuals, adults and youth, in a different way. We are asking people to look at them as an extension of our human resource system, at least as I see it. These are people that of and by themselves, depending on how they are organized and programmed, can make a significant difference.

The problem, quite frankly, that I would have philosophically and programmatically with the JTPA system taking this over is that, quite frankly, JTPA operates out of a deficit model. They don't see people the same way that folks in the national community service arena see people.

Senator SIMON. I might add we hope to change that with the new JTPA bill.

Mr. SLOBIG. Right.

Senator SIMON. I am just thinking out loud. What if we said you use the PIC administrative structure unless a Governor or a mayor chooses another option, and then let them set up some other option which would have to be approved by the Secretary of Labor or someone?

Mr. SLOBIG. It is possible.

Senator SIMON. All right. You mentioned also—and I can't read my own handwriting here—something about targeting.

Mr. SLOBIG. The provisions in the school-conditioned youth service part of your bill is targeted. There are five categories of young people that would be eligible for participation. If you accepted the notion of trying to integrate it more closely into the K-12 part of the National Community Service Act, you have a mismatch. This is non-targeted.

You can make an argument and a case for targeting either way, and once again, as an old JTPA person, I have grown to detest targeting, quite frankly. I know it is a sensitive issue up here, but, quite frankly, my experience has been that when you end up focusing on providing programs for poor kids, all too often the programs end up being viewed—maybe not really, but they become, quite frankly, perceived and viewed as poor programs.

Senator SIMON. This is one of the reasons we have a requirement that everyone in the program isn't going to be on welfare so that we can avoid that kind of a public relations statement.

Any final words of wisdom? Ms. Sweeney, you have wisdom.

Ms. SWEENEY. I am not sure if it is wisdom, but I just wanted to point out that the disparities that you point out, Senator, between AFDC levels in different States, there really is a problem within a State when you have somebody getting a much higher unemploy-

ment comp benefit than an AFDC benefit. And that may actually be much more troubling than the disparities across State lines.

Senator SIMON. Across States lines, you know, if you live in Gary, IN, or East Chicago, IN, and just across the line in Illinois people are being paid appreciably more for the same work, you know, there are going to be problems between States. But some of these problems, frankly, we just have to live with, and we are going to have to live with some criticism on the thing. But I think it is important that we get this launched and at least started in this direction.

Mr. SLOBIG. One technical consideration that I would point out is that in the language in subtitles C and D, oftentimes there is employment language that is used, and I would look very carefully at that to change words like "employ" to "engage" so you mute the notions of an employer-employee relationship where you really don't have an employer-employee relationship.

Senator SIMON. OK. And let me just add, I am going to ask Lisa Montgomery and Brian Kennedy from my staff to go over all your testimony in detail so that we have your suggestions. I can't guarantee you we are going to take all of them. One of the problems, there are a lot of ideas that I would like to do. It is the old line of the best being the enemy of the good. What we have to do is to get something that we can pass here, and we are going to do the best we can.

Thank you very, very much.

Senator SIMON. Since Mayor Schmoke has been unable to get back, we will include his statement for the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Schmoke and material submitted for the record follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MR. SCHMOKE

Senator Simon, members of the committee, I am Kurt Schmoke, mayor of Baltimore. I appear before you today on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors to indicate our support for the Community Works Progress Act of 1992. Many people in this Nation need jobs, and many jobs need doing. The Community Works Progress Act will help us to address both of these needs.

Last summer, even before the full effects of the current recession were felt nationally, the Nation's mayors saw the problems of unemployment in their cities. We saw the effects of unemployment and underemployment on the people of our cities, and we were well aware of the work required to benefit our cities and our citizens. To address the significant human deficit and service deficit which we face, the conference adopted jobs as its top priority.

At the conference's winter meeting in January, we developed an economic stimulus package for the Nation's cities totaling $34.8 billion. It includes seven initiatives:

$15 billion for targeted fiscal assistance to provide direct aid to cities based on measures of fiscal distress and levels of unemployment. (These funds would be targeted to public safety, public works, infrastructure, housing, education and social services. A 100-city survey just released by the U.S. Conference of Mayors shows the urgent need for targeted fiscal assistance. We found that before the end of this year, more than half of the cities will need to cut their city work force, 45 percent will have to cut city services, and just under one-half will need to request tax or user fee increases.)

$5 billion for public works, urban and suburban projects that are "ready to go." (In February, we determined through a survey of 506 cities that there were 7,252 projects ready to go which have the potential to employ 418,415 workers. The missing ingredients: the $12.9 billion needed this year to get the projects going and the additional $13.8 billion to complete them.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At least $6 billion for the community development block grant program to generate an estimated 200,000 jobs. (Some program regulations would have to be waived to facilitate quick application of these funds.)

An additional $4 billion for transportation (by exempting the non-federal share of fiscal year 1992 transportation projects and waiving certain federal mandates).

$2.8 billion for the Job Training Partnership Act to employ unemployed inner-city youth this summer (and to provide employment and training services to income-eligible youth and adults and to train, retrain and employ dislocated workers).

$2 billion for low interest loans to small businesses in urban areas.

Extension of the fiscal year 1992 waiver of the Home Investment Partnership state and local matching requirement through fiscal 1993.

In January, we called for immediate passage of our economic stimulus program, and we called for tearing down the budget "firewalls" so that it could be funded. The need is just as great, if not greater, today. We continue our call for immediate action.

This package put forth on behalf of the mayors of this Nation recognizes the importance of an immediate creation of jobs as the key to economic stimulation. It recognizes the importance of an immediate creation of jobs to put our skilled workers back to work, as well as the creation of job opportunities and training for the unskilled and disadvantaged residents of our communities. It addresses the job needs of our residents and the infrastructure and community service needs simultaneously. It is for this reason that I am here supporting the Community Works Progress bill.

The Community Works Progress bill would make it possible for cities to create some of these unskilled jobs and to provide an important employment opportunity to low-income unemployed persons and to young people in our cities. The benefits are mutual and significant. Not only would we be able to address important community needs, but we would be able to provide both a salary and work experience to those who currently have neither.

I mentioned earlier the number of public works projects that need to be done and the hundreds of thousands of workers who could be employed. There are at least as many community service projects that need to be done, and at least as many workers could be employed in doing them.

We need more aides in our child care centers and in our senior citizen facilities. We need to keep our parks clean and make improvements in them. We need to provide recreational activities for our children. We need help in our homeless shelters and soup kitchens. And we need crews who can undertake neighborhood cleanup and improvement projects. The WPA bill would also help us to supplement many of our existing efforts and to undertake some new ones, and it would help us to do this now. It would enable us to provide jobs to many unskilled workers, just as public works legislation would help us to provide jobs to many skilled workers. I should add that my intent in supporting this bill is not to undercut people who are currently employed, but to give skills and opportunities to those who are ready to fill jobs that are not now being performed.

In Baltimore, we have thousands of individuals who are ready to work, who are able to work, and who desperately want to work. Even as the Nation recovers from its economic crisis, these people are in danger of being left behind because they are far outside the economic mainstream.

I support the creation of community work projects because I am concerned about what is happening to our young people. Half of our youth do not graduate from high school. Most of those dropouts are reaching adulthood deficient in the basic skills, without ever having worked and, in many instances, coming from households where there is no working parent.

I also support the bill because I am concerned about the 10% of Baltimore's work force who are unemployed. In particular, those workers with marginal skills or unmarketable skills who will remain part of the long-term unemployed. I am even more concerned about the unemployed, discouraged workers who do not show up in the official jobless statistics because they have exhausted their unemployment insurance and have given up the job search.

I support this bill because I am concerned about families on welfare. I know that most of them are on the rolls due to circumstance and not choice. Baltimore, which has only 17% of the state's population, houses 52% of the AFDC caseload and 75% of the general public assistance caseload. We have seen the welfare rolls rise at a rapid pace over the past two years as companies have closed, downsized or relocated. In Baltimore, we feel we have one of the most progressive welfare-to-work strategies

in this country. I have witnessed, first hand, the desire on the part of welfare recipients to work and be productive.

I support this bill because I have witnessed what is happening in our communities. Along with the physical deterioration and the erosion of services, there is a debilitating deterioration or spirit. Drive through any inner-city neighborhood during work hours and you will see able-bodied individuals on stoops and corners. Policy-makers make a mistake in concluding that these individuals are idle because they don't want to work and are complacent with their lot in life.

We need desperately to tap their potential and make it work to rebuild our neighborhoods and restore a sense of community and belonging.

If you listen to the overwhelming cry that emanated from communities in the wake of Los Angeles, it was—"give us jobs . . . help us build!"

The "trickle-down" effect of current economic policy-making will not hit the urban core any time soon, if ever. Nor will the "rising tide theory" life boats that are riddled with holes.

As I encourage the rebuilding of communities and the rebuilding of people's futures through a WPA program, I must stress the importance of ensuring that adequate training is provided to make sure all participants are ready and able to do the jobs they are assigned. It is unfair to them and to those who they will serve to do otherwise.

I must stress as well the importance of making sure that anyone hired through this effort is assisted in moving to another job when the WPA job ends. Providing a job is very important, but we must also use this time as an opportunity to develop the employment and job search skills that each person will need to find and keep a permanent job.

We must also discuss the programs proposed in the bill that would provide work opportunities and experience to young people these provisions are extremely important. They would assist us in demonstrating to young people the importance of working and or contributing to their communities. These provisions would provide young people with a job, and with a strong incentive to further their education after high school. I would urge raising the age limit from 21 to 25. So many of our youth reach 21 ill-prepared and could benefit from the urban corps model.

I see the creation of a community WPA as an important part of the "safety net" that has been talked about but never fully implemented. The WPA would offer the opportunity to earn an income and remain productive when all else has failed. But let me stress that while we are talking about immediate intervention that is urgently needed, shoring up the safety net is not the long-term solution.

Baltimore's economy, like much of the rest of the Nation, has drifted from a strong manufacturing base offering lots of unskilled jobs to a service and technology base. Now, 16 of the area's 50 largest employers are in the life sciences field. The key to long-term sustained improvement in the quality of urban life and full participation of city residents is to help our youth reach adulthood equipped to succeed in a technology dominated world.

We will need policy-makers who are willing to make the investments necessary to educate our youth, to assure equity in educational opportunities, and to re-educate and retool the adult work force. I will also urge that care be taken to assure that funds are targeted to the jurisdictions of states where problems are more critical. As we have learned from the JTPA allocation experience, state level data masks the true need in urban centers.

There are two issues relating to the funding of projects within the states which must be addressed. First, the statute should ensure that funds be targeted to cities and other areas within the state which demonstrate the greatest need. You may wish to include in the bill language which establishes criteria—unemployment rate, poverty rate and welfare caseload—for the allocation of funds on a sub-state basis. Second, the mayor or chief elected official of the local jurisdiction must play a key role in deciding which projects are funded. Currently in the bill, discretion for all funding decisions rests with the Governor. That discretion should rest with local officials—those who can best identify local needs and implement projects to address them.

I commend Senator David Boren for the initiative he has taken in establishing a modern-day works progress administration to address our Nation's needs. It is important legislation which should be quickly enacted into law. It should be viewed, however, as an essential piece of a broader legislative package which would address the serious needs of our cities and our citizens.

On behalf of all of the Nation's mayors, I urge you to enact our entire seven-point program. Our people need jobs. Our cities need investment.

Thank you.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Whereupon, at 5:17 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

(Wednesday, March 15, 1989)

PUBLIC SERVICE—IT'S GOTTEN A BAD NAME IN RECENT YEARS, BUT IT MAY BE MAKING A COMEBACK

Gov. Casey has just launched two initiatives to give more young people what he calls the "powerful and contagious" feeling of serving others. He is using grants to coax public schools to include service projects in the curriculum. And he's pushing private industry councils—which use federal aid to provide summer jobs to disadvantaged young people—to develop community-oriented group tasks that create an esprit de corps. Mr. Casey is on target twice.

Indeed, with cooperation from the business community, schools and private philanthropies, the governor is making Pennsylvania a leader in service programs. And if Philadelphia keeps its momentum, it could emerge as a pathfinding city in community service.

One sign of this city's potential: In the statewide competition for 40 school grants worth $5,000 a year, Philadelphia's schools won 11 of them. Lincoln High School in Mayfair was the only school in the state that won two separate grants. Helped by this state aid, roughly 2,000 public school students in Philadelphia—half at the high school level and half in lower grades—will participate in service projects. These include working against an illegal dump, developing a neighborhood museum and spiffing up public properties.

At a news conference about the state's two initiatives on Monday, Theresa E. Simmonds, a sophomore at the University of Pennsylvania, rightly faulted educational institutions for offering too few programs that would tap the "the tremendous amount of energy and enthusiasm and caring on college campuses, in high schools and in elementary schools." One example of that failure: Only 59 schools statewide even applied for the community-service grants.

As for the other Casey initiative, three-quarters of Pennsylvania's private industry councils have responded favorably, saying that at least some of their summer-job money will go into team-oriented programs like that of the year-round Philadelphia Youth Service Corp. (PYSC). To get a sense of the disadvantages that people in this program and others like it are struggling to overcome, one PYSC participant was shot in the ribs last Wednesday but made it to a job interview Friday. With its combinations of physical discipline, low pay and hard work in areas such as housing improvements, this program gives individuals aged 17 through 21 a chance to go against the odds.

Thanks to Mr. Casey's push, a small amount of the city's $4.8 million in federal summer jobs aid this summer will allow about 50 young Philadelphians to do some work PYSC-style. It's an approach that has worked. We hope it will grow.

Eventually, the federal government may retake the initiative on such service programs. Meanwhile, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia can help to lead the way.

THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

(By David S. Broder)

Wednesday, May 13, 1992

FOR HINTS ON HOW THE RACES CAN COEXIST, LOOK NO FATHER THAN THE U.S. MILITARY

Of the millions of words spoken and written in the aftermath of the Rodney King verdict and the Los Angeles riots, none were more pertinent, pointed and eloquent than those of Gen. Colin L. Powell, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Addressing the graduating class of Fisk University in Nashville, his wife's alma mater, Powell reflected not only his own remarkable character but also the special moral authority he gains from the largely unrecognized performance of the institution to which he has devoted his adult life—the United States military.

Here is the gist of Powell's message, for those who have not heard it or read it:

"As I saw those pictures on my television set," he began, "my heart hurt . . . I didn't want to believe what I was seeing.

"Violence—by the police or by the mob—is not the answer . . . It shouldn't be; we've come too far for this. But it did happen. And we see once again what a long

way we still have to go. Because the problem goes beyond Rodney King. The problem goes beyond Los Angeles. It goes beyond the trial of those four officers.

"The problem goes to the despair that still exists in the black community over the inability of black Americans to share fully in the American dream. Too many African Americans are still trapped in a cycle where poverty, violence, drugs, bad housing, inadequate education, lack of jobs and loss of faith combine to create a sad human condition, a human condition that cannot be allowed to continue if this nation is to hold its rightful place in the world.

"We have an American problem," Powell said. "It can only be solved by all Americans working together."

Respecting the inhibitions of his official position, the general did not outline an agenda for governmental action. Instead, he addressed the graduates—and through them, all Americans—about the responsibilities of citizens in this crisis.

"First," he said, "I want you to believe in yourself. You have to know that you are capable, that you are competent, that you are good . . .

"Second, I want you to believe in America . . . We are still, as Abraham Lincoln said, 'the last, best hope of earth.'

"Third, I want you to find strength in your diversity. Let the fact that you are black or yellow or white be a source of pride and inspiration to you. Draw strength from it. Let it be someone else's problem, but never yours. Never hide behind it or use it as an excuse for not doing your best . . .

"Finally, I want you to raise strong families. As you raise your families, remember the worst kind of poverty is not economic poverty, it is the poverty of values. It is poverty of caring. It is the poverty of love."

Obviously, the man who said this is a remarkable person. But he is also the product—and symbol—of a remarkable institution, the United States military, which in the last two generations has probably done more and succeeded better in creating a non-racist, bias-free meritocracy than any other part of American society. Powell's position as the head of the armed services symbolizes, but does not begin to describe, this success story.

The scope of the change was pointed out to me last year by David Gergen, the wise editor at-large of U.S. News & World Report, when we participated in a program at the Army War College. Gergen made the point then that the military's combination of disciplined structure and genuinely color-blind opportunity for advancement had transformed the lives of thousands of minority youths—and made the non-commissioned officers' (NCO) and officers' clubs far more integrated than college faculties, business boardrooms or newsrooms.

Gergen argues passionately that the military services and its people have vital experiences and lessons to share with civilian America. Last week, I heard the same point made by historian Stephen Ambrose, who has been spending time on military bases in connection with his own work. Ambrose made a historian's point: "There's all this argument about whether the Great Society programs worked, or whether Jack Kemp's enterprise zones will work. Why not return to ideas that everyone agrees did work?"

One of those ideas, he says, was the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of New Deal days, which took unemployed youths and put them to work on what we would now call environmental projects.

"It was run by the military," Ambrose said, "when the military had not much else to do. It pulled those kids out of the morass of their lives, gave them a sense of identity and discipline and of group purpose—the same things they need now."

Like Gergen, Ambrose noted that thousands of men and women—senior NCOs and junior officers in their 30s—face involuntary separation from their military careers because of the post-Cold War budget cuts. Why not take these young Colin Powells and let them lead a new CCC, he asks.

Why not?

○

ISBN 0-16-038904-6

90000

9 780160 389047